Guidelines for the Prevention of Intravascular Catheter-Related Infections

Prepared by

Naomi P. O'Grady, M.D.[1]
Mary Alexander, R.N.[2]
Lillian A. Burns, M.T., M.P.H., C.I.C.[3]
E. Patchen Dellinger, M.D.[4]
Jeffery Garland, M.D.[5]
Stephen O. Heard, M.D.[6]
Pamela A. Lipsett, M.D.[7]
Henry Masur, M.D.[1]
Leonard A. Mermel, D.O., Sc.M.[8]
Michele L. Pearson, M.D.[9]
Issam I. Raad, M.D.[10]
Adrienne Randolph, M.D., M.Sc.[11]
Mark E. Rupp, M.D.[12]
Sanjay Saint, M.D., M.P.H.[13]

1National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland
2Infusion Nurses Society, Norwood, Massachusetts
3Greenich Hospital, Greenwich, Connecticut
4University of Washington, Seattle, Washington
5Wheaton Franciscan Healthcare-St. Joseph, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
6 University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, Massachusetts
7Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland
8Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University and Rhode Island Hospital, Providence, Rhode Island
9 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia
10MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas
11The Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts
12University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, Nebraska
13Ann Arbor VA Medical Center and University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Introduction

These guidelines have been developed for practitioners who insert catheters and for persons responsible for surveillance and control of infections in hospital, outpatient, and home healthcare settings. This report was prepared by a working group comprised of members from professional organizations representing the disciplines of critical care medicine, infectious diseases, healthcare infection control, surgery, anesthesiology, interventional radiology, pulmonary medicine, pediatric medicine, and nursing. The working group was led by the Society of Critical Care Medicine (SCCM), in collaboration with the Infectious Disease Society of America (IDSA), Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America (SHEA), Surgical Infection Society (SIS), American College of Chest Physicians (ACCP), American Thoracic Society (ATS), American Society of Critical Care Anesthesiologists (ASCCA), Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology (APIC), Infusion Nurses Society (INS), Oncology Nursing Society (ONS), Society of Cardiovascular and Interventional Radiology (SCVIR), American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), and the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee (HICPAC) of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and is intended to replace the Guideline for Prevention of Intravascular Device-Related Infections published in 2002. These guidelines are intended to provide evidence-based recommendations for preventing catheter-related infections. Major areas of emphasis include 1) educating and training healthcare personnel who insert and maintain catheters; 2) using maximal sterile barrier precautions during central venous catheter insertion; 3) using a 2% chlorhexidine preparation for skin antisepsis; 4) avoiding routine replacement of central venous catheters as a strategy to prevent

Deleted: ing

infection; and 5) using antiseptic/antibiotic impregnated short-term central venous catheters and chlorhexidine impregnated sponge dressings if the rate of infection is high despite adherence to other strategies (i.e., education and training, maximal sterile barrier precautions, and 2% chlorhexidine for skin antisepsis). These guidelines also emphasize performance improvement by implementing bundled strategies, documenting and reporting rates of adherence to all components of the bundle as benchmarks for quality assurance and performance improvement.

Deleted: compliance rates with

As in previous guidelines issued by CDC and HICPAC, each recommendation is categorized on the basis of existing scientific data, theoretical rationale, applicability, and economic impact. The CDC/HICPAC system for categorizing recommendations is as follows:

Category IA. Strongly recommended for implementation and strongly supported by well-designed experimental, clinical, or epidemiologic studies.

Category IB. Strongly recommended for implementation and supported by some experimental, clinical, or epidemiologic studies, and a strong theoretical rationale.

Category IC. Required by state or federal regulations, rules, or standards.

Category II. Suggested for implementation and supported by suggestive clinical or epidemiologic studies or a theoretical rationale.

Unresolved issue. Represents an unresolved issue for which evidence is insufficient or no consensus regarding efficacy exists.

Intravascular Catheter-Related Infections in Adult and Pediatric Patients: An Overview

Background

In the United States, 15 million central vascular catheter (CVC) days (i.e., the total number of days of exposure to CVCs by all patients in the selected population during the selected time period) occur in intensive care units (ICUs) each year [1]. Catheter-related bloodstream infections (CRBSI) independently increase hospital costs and length of stay [2-5], but have not been shown to independently increase mortality. While 80,000 CVC-associated BSIs occur in ICUs each year [1], a total of 250,000 cases of CVC-associated BSIs have been estimated to occur annually, if entire hospitals are assessed [6]. By several analyses, the cost of CVC-associated BSI is substantial, both in terms of morbidity and financial resources expended. To improve patient outcome and to reduce healthcare costs, there is considerable interest by healthcare personnel, insurers, regulators, and patient advocates reducing the incidence of these infections. This effort should be multidisciplinary, involving healthcare personnel who order the insertion and removal of CVCs, those personnel who insert and maintain intravascular catheters, infection control personnel, healthcare managers from the CEO down to those who allocate resources, and patients who are capable of assisting in the care of their catheters. Personnel should recognize that the goal of an effective prevention program is continuous reduction in catheter-related infections. Elimination of catheter-related infection is a laudable goal; demonstrating that elimination of CRBSIs can be sustained and encompass CVCs placed at all points of care, e.g., ICU, med-surg, home care, etc., is challenging. There are programs that have demonstrated success, but most programs will recognize some catheter-related infections over time. The goal of the measures discussed in this document is to reduce the rate to as low as feasible given the specific patient population

Comment [JDS1]: ? MRSA and VRE CLABSIs associated with increased mortality

Deleted: the

being served, the universal presence of microorganisms in the human environment, and the limitations of current strategies and technologies.

Terminology and Estimates of Risk

The terminology used to identify different types of catheters is confusing, because many clinicians and researchers use different aspects of the catheter for informal reference. A catheter can be designated by the type of vessel it occupies (e.g., peripheral venous, central venous, or arterial); its intended life span (e.g., temporary or short-term versus permanent or long-term); its site of insertion (e.g., subclavian, femoral, internal jugular, peripheral, and peripherally inserted central catheter [PICC]); its pathway from skin to vessel (e.g., tunneled versus nontunneled); its physical length (e.g., long versus short); or some special characteristic of the catheter (e.g., presence or absence of a cuff, impregnation with heparin, antibiotics or antiseptics, and the number of lumens). To accurately define a specific type of catheter, all of these aspects should be described (Table 1).

Comment [JDS2]: definitions of short term, long term

The rate of all catheter-related infections, including local infections and systemic infections, is difficult to determine. Potentially infectious episodes must be evaluated clinically and microbiologically and documented in the record; the data must be reviewed by well informed and fairly adjudicated personnel as to whether an episode is due to infection or contamination and if infection is present, whether it is related to the CVC or to a secondary source. Although CRBSI is a suitable parameter because it represents the most serious form of catheter-related infection, it is often problematic to precisely establish the diagnosis given the clinical setting of the patient (the catheter is not always removed), limited availability of microbiologic methods (many labs do not use

Comment [JDS3]: not sure this is an accepted use of this word

Formatted: Highlight

quantitative blood cultures or differential time to positivity), and support by direct care personnel (labeling must be accurate). Given these challenges, simpler automated methods relying on microbiological data alone, albeit less precise, may offer convenient alternatives to manual surveillance methods. Simplified objective criteria may be potentially superior to clinical criteria in identifying the true differences in CRBSI rates between institutions [7-10].

Healthcare personnel should recognize the difference between the surveillance definition (i.e., the definition that is used to benchmark institutions reporting to the National Healthcare Safety Network [NHSN] and clinical definitions. The NHSN surveillance definition is for BSIs, including central-line associated BSIs, when other documented sites of infection have been excluded (http://www.cdc.gov/nhsn/PDFs/pscManual/4PSC_CLABScurrent.pdf)[11]. That is, the surveillance definition overestimates the true incidence of CRBSI because not all BSIs originate from a catheter. Some bacteremias are secondary BSIs from unrecognized sources (e.g., postoperative surgical sites, intra-abdominal infections, and hospital-associated pneumonia or urinary tract infections). Thus, surveillance definitions are really definitions for catheter-*associated* BSIs. Within this definition is opportunity for subjective bias since some reviewers may be more prone than others to attribute the BSI to other sources based on only vague, unconvincing information. This provides opportunities for published rates of BSIs to be influenced by assessment teams with motivation to record low rates.

A more rigorous definition might include only those BSIs for which other sources were excluded by careful examination of the patient record, and where a culture of the

catheter-tip demonstrated substantial colonies of an organism identical to those found in the bloodstream. Interpreting blood cultures drawn from catheters presents its own set of challenges, but clinical definitions have been developed to take the results of such blood cultures into account when establishing a diagnosis of CRBSI [12].Such a clinical /microbiological definition would focus on catheter-*related* BSIs. Therefore, to accurately compare a healthcare facility's CRBSI infection rate to published data, comparable definitions also should be used.

Comment [JDS4]: Important to include information on why catheter tips should not be cultured routinely.

CDC and The Joint Commission recommend that the rate of catheter-associated BSIs (CABSIs) be expressed as the number of CABSIs per 1,000 CVC days [13, 14]. This parameter provides longitudinal data not expressed when the rate is expressed as the number of catheter-associated infections per 100 catheters (or percentage of catheters studied), because it accounts for BSIs over time and, therefore, adjusts risk for the number of days the catheter is in use.

Comment [JDS5]: "because this denominator adjusts for duration of risk"

Epidemiology and Microbiology in Adult and Pediatric Patients

National estimates of CABSI rates are available through CDC's NHSN (www.cdc.gov/nhsn). The most recently published NHSN data represent reports from 621 hospitals in 45 States and the District of Columbia that monitor infections in one or more ICUs and/or non-ICUs (e.g., patient care areas, wards) [15]. Because BSI rates are influenced by patient-related factors, such as severity of illness and type of illness (e.g., third-degree burns versus post-cardiac surgery), by catheter-related factors, (such as the condition under which the catheter was placed and catheter type), and by institutional factors (e.g., bed-size, academic affiliation), these aggregate, risk-adjusted rates can be

used as benchmarks against which hospitals can make intra- and inter-facility comparisons.

Among hospitals participating in NHSN during 2006, the reported pooled mean rates of central venous CABSIs ranged from 1.3/1000 catheter days on inpatient medical/surgical wards to 5.6/1000 catheter days in burn ICUs (Table 2). In neonatal nurseries for infants weighing less than 1,000 grams (Level III), central line-associated BSI rates ranged from 3.3-3.7/1,000 catheter days [15]. In these nurseries, umbilical catheter rates also varied by birth weight category, ranging from 0.9/1,000 catheter days among neonates weighing above 1,500 grams to 4.7/1,000 catheter days among neonates weighing 750 grams or less [15]. Secular trends suggest a reduction in the incidence of central venous CABSIs occurring in ICUs during the past 20 years.

Comment [JDS6]: Would use CLABSI instead of CABSI because that is what is used by NHSN. It is too confusing to go back and forth between the two.

Deleted: over

The most commonly reported causative pathogens for hospital acquired BSIs remain coagulase-negative staphylococci, *Staphylococcus aureus*, enterococci, and *Candida* spp. [16]. Gram negative bacilli accounted for 19% and 21% of catheter associated BSIs reported to CDC [17] and the Surveillance and Control of Pathogens of Epidemiological Importance (SCOPE) database, respectively [16].

For all common pathogens causing CRBSIs, antimicrobial resistance is a problem, particularly in ICUs. Although methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) now accounts for more than 50% of all *Staphylococcus aureus* isolates obtained in ICUs, the incidence of MRSA CABSIs has decreased in recent years, most likely as a result of prevention efforts [18] For gram negative rods, antimicrobial resistance to third generation cephalosporins among *Klebsiella pneumoniae* and *E. coli* have increased

Deleted: perhaps

195 significantly as did imipenem and ceftazidine resistance among *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*
196 [17]. *Candida* spp. are noted to be increasingly resistant to fluconazole.

197 As in adults, the majority of BSIs in children are associated with the use of an
198 intravascular catheter. From 2002 through 2004, the pooled mean CABSI rate for all
199 pediatric ICUs reporting data to NNIS was 6.6 per 1,000 catheter days [14]. This rate has
200 decreased compared to the 1995-2000 data, but is consistently higher than that reported in
201 adult medical-surgical ICUs during the 2002-2004 time period . Umbilical catheter and CVC-associated BSI rates for
202 neonatal ICUs ranged from 3.7-4.7 per 1,000 catheter days in children with birth weight
203 <750 gram to 1.0-2.0 per 1,000 catheter days in children whose birth weight was >2,500
204 gram [19]. Catheter utilization ratios were comparable in adult and pediatric ICUs [20,
205 21].

206 The distribution of types of organisms causing infection is similar in pediatric
207 ICUs and adult ICUs [21]. As in adults, the majority of CRBSIs in children are caused
208 by coagulase-negative staphylococci. During 1992-1999, these bacteria accounted for
209 37.7% of BSIs in pediatric ICUs reporting to NNIS [21]. Among neonates with
210 percutaneously placed central venous catheters, coagulase-negative staphylococci are
211 responsible for 75% of CRBSIs [22, 23].

212 **Pathogenesis**

213 There are four recognized routes for contamination of catheters: 1) migration of
214 skin organisms at the insertion site into the cutaneous catheter tract and along the surface
215 of the catheter with colonization of the catheter tip; this is the most common route of
216 infection for short-term catheters [24-26]; 2) direct contamination of the catheter or
217 catheter hub by contact with hands or contaminated fluids or devices [27, 28]; 3) less

Deleted: increasingly
Deleted: resistant
Deleted: e

commonly, catheters might become hematogenously seeded from another focus of infection [29]; and 4) rarely, infusate contamination might lead to CRBSI [30].

Important pathogenic determinants of catheter-related infection are 1) the material of which the device is made; 2) the host factors consisting of protein adhesions, such as fibrin and fibronectin that form a sheath around the catheter [31]; and 3) the intrinsic virulence factors of the infecting organism, including the extracellular polymeric substance (EPS) produced by the adherent organisms [32]. Some catheter materials also have surface irregularities that enhance the microbial adherence of certain species (e.g., *S. epidermidis* and *C. albicans*) [33, 34]. Catheters made of these materials are especially vulnerable to microbial colonization and subsequent infection. After the formation of the fibrin sheath, silastic catheters are more prone to catheter infections than polyurethane catheters [31]. On the other hand, biofilm formation by *C. albicans* occurs more intensely on silicone elastomer catheter surfaces than polyurethane catheters [33]. Modification of the biomaterial surface properties has been shown to influence the ability of *C. albicans* to form biofilm [34]. Additionally, certain catheter materials are more thrombogenic than others, a characteristic that also might predispose to catheter colonization and catheter-related infection [35, 36]. This association has led to emphasis on preventing catheter-related thrombus as an additional mechanism for reducing CRBSI [37, 38].

The adherence properties of a given microorganism in relationship to host factors are also important in the pathogenesis of catheter-related infection. For example, *S. aureus* can adhere to host proteins (e.g., fibrinogen, fibronectin) commonly present on catheters by expressing clumping factors (ClfA and ClfB) that bind to the protein

Comment [JDS7]: Wouldn't immune system status be included as a host factor?

Comment [JDS8]: Not really "on theother hand"; additionally might be a better word.

adhesins [31, 36, 39, 40]. Furthermore, adherence is enhanced through the production of EPS by microbial organisms, such as coagulase-negative staphylococci [41, 42], *S. aureus* [43], *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* [44], and *Candida* spp. [45], consisting mostly of an exopolysaccharide that forms a microbial biofilm layer [32, 46]. This biofilm matrix is enriched by divalent metallic cations, such as calcium, magnesium and iron, which make it a solid enclave for microbial organisms to embed themselves [47-49]. In the presence of catheters, this biofilm potentiates the pathogenicity of various microbes by allowing them to withstand host defense mechanisms (e.g., acting as a barrier to engulfment and killing by polymorphonuclear leukocytes) or by making them less susceptible to antimicrobial agents (e.g., forming a matrix that binds antimicrobials before their contact with the organism cell wall) [42, 50, 51]. Some *Candida* spp., in the presence of glucose-containing fluids, produce slime similar to that of their bacterial counterparts, potentially explaining the increased proportion of BSIs caused by fungal pathogens among patients receiving parenteral nutrition fluids [52].

Formatted: Portuguese (Brazil)

Comment [JDS9]: Is there anything that can be done to alter the biofilms as a prevention strategy?

Strategies for Prevention of Catheter-Related Infections in Adult and Pediatric Patients

Education, training and staffing

Recommendations

Comment [JDS10]: Should there be a recommendation for joining collaboratives to reduce CLABSI rates?

1. Educate healthcare personnel regarding the indications for intravascular catheter use, proper procedures for the insertion and maintenance of intravascular catheters, and appropriate infection control measures to prevent intravascular catheter-related infections [53-61]. Category IA

2. Periodically assess knowledge of and adherence to guidelines for all persons who are involved in the insertion and maintenance of intravascular catheters [53-61]. Category IA

3. Designate only trained personnel who demonstrate competence for the insertion and maintenance of peripheral and central intravascular catheters. [60-74]. Category IA

4. Ensure appropriate nursing staff levels in ICUs to minimize the incidence of catheter-related BSIs. Observational studies suggest a ratio of 2:1 in ICUs where nurses are managing patients with CVCs [75-77]. Category IB

Background

Well-organized programs that enable healthcare personnel to become educated and to provide, monitor, and evaluate care are critical to the success of this effort. Reports spanning the past four decades have consistently demonstrated that risk for infection declines following standardization of aseptic care [53, 58, 60, 61, 78-80] and that insertion and maintenance of intravascular catheters by inexperienced staff might increase the risk for catheter colonization and CRBSI [61, 81]. Specialized "IV teams" have shown unequivocal effectiveness in reducing the incidence of catheter-related infections, associated complications, and costs [62-72]. Additionally, infection risk increases with nursing staff reductions below a critical level [76].

Deleted: might

Site selection

Recommendations for peripheral catheters and midline catheters

1. In adults, use an upper-extremity site for catheter insertion. Replace a catheter inserted in a lower extremity site to an upper extremity site as soon as possible [82, 83]. Category IB

2. In pediatric patients, the upper or lower extremities or the scalp can be used as the catheter insertion site [82, 83]. Category II

3. Select catheters on the basis of the intended purpose and duration of use, known infectious and non-infectious complications (e.g., phlebitis and infiltration), and experience of individual catheter operators [83-85]. Category IB

4. Avoid the use of steel needles for the administration of fluids and medication that might cause tissue necrosis, if extravasation occurs [83-85]. Category IA

5. Use a midline catheter or peripherally inserted central catheter (PICC), instead of a short peripheral catheter, when the duration of IV therapy will likely exceed six days [83-85]. Category IB

Recommendations for central venous catheters

6. Weigh the risk and benefits of placing a central venous device at a recommended site to reduce infectious complications against the risk for mechanical complications (e.g., pneumothorax, subclavian artery puncture, subclavian vein laceration, subclavian vein stenosis, hemothorax, thrombosis, air embolism, and catheter misplacement) [25, 86-101]. Category IA

7. Use a subclavian site, rather than a jugular or a femoral site, in adult patients to minimize infection risk for nontunneled CVC placement [25, 99, 100]. Category IA

8. No recommendation can be made for a preferred site of insertion to minimize infection risk for a tunneled CVC. Unresolved issue

9. Place catheters used for hemodialysis and pheresis in a jugular or femoral vein, rather than a subclavian vein, to avoid venous stenosis [101-105]. Category IA

10. Use ultrasound guidance to place central venous catheters to reduce the number of cannulation attempts and mechanical complications if this technology is available [106, 107]. Category 1B

Comment [JDS11]: Should you include3 use of a sterile sleeve on the ultrasound probe and cord?

11. Promptly remove any intravascular catheter that is no longer essential [108, 109].

Category IA

Background

The site at which a catheter is placed influences the subsequent risk for catheter-related infection and phlebitis. The influence of site on the risk for catheter infections is related in part to the risk for thrombophlebitis, density of local skin flora, and risk of contamination by infectious body fluids, e.g., stool, saliva..

Deleted: and

Phlebitis has long been recognized as a risk for infection. For adults, lower extremity insertion sites are associated with a higher risk for infection than are upper extremity sites [110-112]. In addition, hand veins have a lower risk for phlebitis than do veins on the wrist or upper arm [113]. As in adults, the use of peripheral venous catheters in pediatric patients might be complicated by phlebitis, infusion extravasation, and catheter infection [114]. Catheter location, infusion of parenteral nutritional fluids with continuous IV lipid emulsions, and length of ICU stay before catheter insertion have all increased pediatric patients' risk for phlebitis. However, contrary to the risk in adults, the risk for phlebitis in children has not increased with the duration of catheterization [114, 115].

The density of skin flora at the catheter insertion site is a major risk factor for CRBSI. Authorities recommend that CVCs be placed in a subclavian site, instead of a jugular or femoral site, to reduce the risk for infection. No single trial has satisfactorily compared infection rates for catheters placed in jugular, subclavian, and femoral vein. In

retrospective observational studies, catheters inserted into an internal jugular vein have usually been associated with higher risk for colonization and/or CRBSI than those inserted into a subclavian or femoral vein [25, 86-95]. Similar findings were noted in neonates in a single retrospective study [116].

Femoral catheters have been demonstrated to have high colonization rates compared to subclavian and internal jugular sites when used in adults and, in some studies, higher rates of CRBSIs [88, 93-95, 98, 99, 117]. Femoral catheters should also be avoided, when possible, because they are associated with a higher risk for deep venous thrombosis than are internal jugular or subclavian catheters [96-98, 101, 118]. One study [86] found that the risk of infection associated with catheters placed in the femoral vein is accentuated in obese patients. In contrast to adults, studies in pediatric patients have demonstrated that femoral catheters have a low incidence of mechanical complications and might have an equivalent infection rate to that of nonfemoral catheters [119-122]. However, diapered children may have an increased risk of contamination with stool.

Thus, in adult patients, a subclavian site is preferred for infection control purposes, although other factors (e.g., the potential for mechanical complications, risk for subclavian vein stenosis, and catheter-operator skill) should be considered when choosing a catheter insertion site.

Deleted: deciding¶
where to place the catheter.

In two meta-analyses, the use of dynamic two-dimensional ultrasound for the placement of CVCs substantially decreased mechanical complications and reduced the number of attempts at required cannulation and failed attempts at cannulation compared with the standard landmark placement [106, 107]. Evidence favors the use of two dimensional ultrasound guidance over Doppler ultrasound guidance [106]. Site selection should be guided by patient comfort, ability to secure the catheter, and maintenance of

asepsis as well as patient-specific factors (e.g., preexisting catheters, anatomic deformity, and bleeding diathesis), relative risk of mechanical complications (e.g., bleeding and pneumothorax), the availability of bedside ultrasound, the experience of the person inserting the catheter, and the risk for infection.

Catheters should be inserted as great a distance as possible from open wounds and from ostomy sites. In one study, catheters inserted close to open burn wounds were 1.79 times more likely to be colonized and 5.12 times more likely to be associated with bacteremia than catheters inserted farther from the wounds [123].

Type of Catheter Material

Polytetrafluoroethylene or polyurethane catheters have been associated with fewer infectious complications than catheters made of polyvinyl chloride or polyethylene [124-126]. Steel needles used as an alternative to catheters for peripheral venous access have the same rate of infectious complications as do polytetrafluoroethylene catheters [83, 84]. However, the use of steel needles frequently is complicated by infiltration of intravenous (IV) fluids into the subcutaneous tissues, a potentially serious complication if the infused fluid is a vesicant [84].

Hand Hygiene and Aseptic Technique

Recommendations

1. Perform hand hygiene procedures, either by washing hands with conventional antiseptic containing soap and water or with waterless alcohol-based hand rubs (ABHR). Hand hygiene should be performed before and after palpating catheter insertion sites as well as before and after inserting, replacing, accessing, repairing, or dressing an intravascular catheter. Palpation of the insertion site should not be performed after the

Deleted: conventional

application of antiseptic, unless aseptic technique is maintained [58, 127-131]. Category IA

2. Maintain aseptic technique for the insertion and care of intravascular catheters [25, 132-134]. Category IA

3. Wear clean gloves, rather than sterile gloves, for the insertion of peripheral intravascular catheters, if the access site is not touched after the application of skin antiseptics. Category IC

4. Wear sterile gloves for the insertion of arterial, central, and midline catheters [25, 132-134]; and change these gloves if a catheter is being exchanged over a guidewire (thereby contaminating the gloves) and a new sterile catheter is then handled. Category IA

Deleted: S

Deleted: should be worn

Deleted: should be changed

4. Wear either clean or sterile gloves when changing the dressing on intravascular catheters. Category IC

Background

Hand hygiene before catheter insertion or maintenance, combined with proper aseptic technique during catheter manipulation, provides protection against infection [58]. Proper hand hygiene can be achieved through the use of either a waterless, alcohol-based product [135] or an antibacterial soap and water with adequate rinsing [127].

Appropriate aseptic technique does not necessarily require sterile gloves for insertion of peripheral catheters; a new pair of disposable nonsterile gloves can be used in conjunction with a "no-touch" technique for the insertion of peripheral venous catheters. Sterile gloves must be worn for placement of central catheters since a “no-touch” technique is not possible.

Maximal Sterile Barrier Precautions

Recommendations

1. Use maximal sterile barrier precautions, including the use of a cap, mask, sterile gown, sterile gloves, and a large sterile full body drape, for the insertion of CVCs, PICCs, or guidewire exchange [60, 132, 136, 137]. Category IB

2. Use a sterile sleeve to protect pulmonary artery catheters during insertion [138]. Category IB

Background

Maximum sterile barrier (MSB) precautions is defined as wearing a sterile gown, sterile gloves, and cap and using a full body drape (similar to the drapes used in the operating room) during the placement of CVC. Maximal sterile barrier precautions during insertion of CVC were compared with sterile gloves and a small drape in a randomized controlled trial. The MSB group had fewer episodes of both catheter colonization (RR = 0.32, 95% CI, 0.10-0.96, P = .04) and CR-BSI (RR = 0.16, 95% CI, 0.02-1.30, P = .06). In addition, the group with MSB had infections that occurred much later and contained gram negative, rather than gram positive, organisms [132]. A study designed to examine pulmonary artery catheters also secondarily demonstrated that use of MSB precautions was one of the items that lowered risk of infection [25]. Another study evaluated an educational program directed at improving infection control practices, especially MSB. In this study, MSB use increased and CRBSI decreased [60]. A small trial demonstrated an reduced risk of skin colonization at the insertion site with maximal barrier precautions [OR 3.40, 95%CI 1.32 to 3.67] [136].

Formatted: French (France)

Skin Preparation

Recommendations

1. Prepare clean skin with 70% alcohol before peripheral venous catheter insertion [139]. Category IA

2. Prepare clean skin site with a 2% chlorhexidine-based preparation before central venous catheter insertion and during dressing changes. If there is a contraindication to chlorhexidine, tincture of iodine, an iodophor, or 70% alcohol can be used as alternatives [140, 141]. Category IA

3. No recommendation can be made for the safety or efficacy of chlorhexidine in infants aged <2 months. Unresolved issue

Comment [JDS12]: Suggest including in the discussion experience with CHG in neonates. It is being used extensively and there are some data.

4. Allow povidone iodine to remain on the skin for at least 2 minutes or longer for the antibacterial properties to take effect, if it is not yet dry before catheter insertion. The antibacterial properties of chlorhexidine work on contact, and chlorhexidine does not require a minimum 2- minute drying time before proceeding. Catheter insertion may begin as soon as the chlorhexidine is dry[140, 141]. Category IB

Comment [JDS13]: So, no drying time at all is requitred with CHG?

Background

Two well-designed studies evaluating the chlorhexidine-containing cutaneous antiseptic regimen in comparison with either povidone iodine or alcohol for the care of an intravascular catheter insertion site have shown lower rates of catheter colonization or CRBSI associated with the chlorhexidine preparation [140, 141]. When 0.5% tincture of chlorhexidine was compared with 10% povidone iodine, no differences were seen in CVC colonization or in CRSBI [142]. In a three-armed study (2% aqueous chlorhexidine gluconate vs 10% povidone-iodine vs 70% alcohol), 2% aqueous chlorhexidine gluconate

446 tended to decrease CRBSI compared with 10% povidone iodine or 70% alcohol [140]. A
447 meta-analysis of 4,143 catheters suggested that chlorhexidine preparation, rather than
448 povidone iodine, reduced the risk of catheter-related infection by 49% (95% CI 0.28 to
449 0.88) [143]. An economic decision analysis based on available evidence suggested that
450 the use of chlorhexidine, rather than povidone iodine, for CVC care would result in a
451 1.6% decrease in the incidence of CRBSI, a 0.23% decrease in the incidence of death,
452 and a savings of $113 per catheter used [144]. While 2% chlorhexidine has become a
453 standard antiseptic for skin preparation for the insertion of both central and peripheral
454 venous catheters, 5% povidone iodine solution in 70% ethanol was associated with a
455 substantial reduction of CVC-related colonization and infection compared with 10%
456 aqueous povidone iodine [145].

Comment [JDS14]: This implies that there is an increased risk of death associated with CLABSI, whereas, earlier in the document, it said that such was not the case.

457 **Catheter site dressing regimens**

458 **Recommendations**

459 1. Use either sterile gauze or sterile, transparent, semi-permeable dressing to cover the
460 catheter site [146-149]. Category IA
461 2. If the patient is diaphoretic or if the site is bleeding or oozing, use gauze dressing until
462 this is resolved [146-149]. Category II
463 3. Replace catheter site dressing if the dressing becomes damp, loosened, or visibly soiled
464 [146, 147]. Category IB
465 4. Do not use topical antibiotic ointment or creams on insertion sites, except for dialysis
466 catheters, because of their potential to promote fungal infections and antimicrobial
467 resistance [150, 151]. Category IB

Comment [JDS15]: What about compatibility of the creams/ointments with the hempodialysis catheters?

5. Do not submerge the catheter or catheter site in water. Showering should be permitted only if precautions can be taken to reduce the likelihood of introducing organisms into the catheter (e.g., if the catheter and connecting device are protected with an impermeable cover during the shower) [152, 153]. Category II

Comment [JDS16]: No data for IB?

6. Replace dressings used on short-term CVC sites every 2 days for gauze dressings and at least every 7 days for transparent dressings, except in those pediatric patients in which the risk for dislodging the catheter may outweigh the benefit of changing the dressing [149]. Category IB

7. Replace dressings used on tunneled or implanted CVC sites no more than once per week, until the insertion site has healed [149]Category IB

8. No recommendation can be made regarding the necessity for any dressing on well-healed exit sites of long-term cuffed and tunneled CVCs. Unresolved issue

9. Ensure that catheter site care is compatible with the catheter material [154, 155]. Category IB

10. Use a sterile sleeve for all pulmonary artery catheters [138]. Category IB

11. Use a chlorhexidine-impregnated sponge dressing for temporary short-term catheters in patients older than 2 months of age, if the CRBSI rate is higher than the institutional goal, despite adherence to basic CRBSI prevention measures, including education and training, use of chlorhexidine for skin antisepsis, and MSB [22, 156-158]. Category 1B

Comment [JDS17]: More specific info. on age, BW criteria?

Background

Transparent, semi-permeable polyurethane dressings permit continuous visual inspection of the catheter site and require less frequent changes than do standard gauze and tape dressings. In the largest controlled trial of dressing regimens on peripheral

catheters, the infectious morbidity associated with the use of transparent dressings on approximately 2,000 peripheral catheters was examined [126]. Data from this study suggest that the rate of colonization among catheters dressed with transparent dressings (5.7%) is comparable to that of those dressed with gauze (4.6%) and that no clinically substantial differences exist in either the incidences of catheter site colonization or phlebitis. Furthermore, these data suggest that transparent dressings can be safely left on peripheral venous catheters for the duration of catheter insertion without increasing the risk for thrombophlebitis [126].

A meta-analysis has assessed studies that compared the risk for CRBSIs for groups using transparent dressings versus groups using gauze dressing [159]. The risk for CRBSIs did not differ between the groups. The choice of dressing can be personal preference. If blood is oozing from the catheter insertion site, gauze dressing is preferred. Another systemic review of randomized controlled trials comparing gauze and tape to transparent dressings found no significant differences in CRBSIs, catheter tip colonization, or skin colonization between dressing types [160].

Chlorhexidine impregnated dressings have been used to reduce the risk of CRBSI. In the largest multicenter randomized controlled trial published to date comparing chlorhexidine impregnated sponge dressings vs standard dressings in ICU patients, rates of CRIs were reduced even when background rates of infection were low. In this study, 1636 patients (3778 catheters, 28 931 catheter-days) were evaluated. The chlorhexidine-impregnated dressings decreased the rates of major CRIs (10/1953 [0.5%], 0.6 per 1000 catheter-days vs 19/1825 [1.1%], 1.4 per 1000 catheter-days; hazard ratio [HR], 0.39 [95% confidence interval {CI}, 0.17-0.93]; $P = .03$) and CRBSIs (6/1953 catheters, 0.40

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: a

Deleted: matter of

Formatted: Highlight

514 per 1000 catheter-days vs 17/1825 catheters, 1.3 per 1000 catheter-days; HR, 0.24 [95%
515 CI, 0.09-0.65]) [156]. A randomized controlled study of 140 children used polyurethane
516 or a chlorhexidine impregnated dressing showed no statistical difference in BSIs;
517 however, the chlorhexidine group had lower rates of CVC colonization [158]. In 601
518 cancer patients receiving chemotherapy, the incidence of CRBSI was reduced in patients
519 receiving the chlorhexidine sponge dressing compared to standard dressings (p=0.016,
520 relative risk 0.54; confidence interval 0.31-0.94) [161]. A meta-analysis that included
521 eight randomized controlled trials demonstrated that chlorhexidine impregnated sponges
522 are associated with a reduction of vascular and epidural catheter exit site colonization
523 (14.8% versus 26.9%, OR 0.47, 95% CI: 0.34 to 0.65) (overall 14.3% versus 27.2%, OR
524 0.40, 95% CI: 0.26–0.61; P < 0.0001), but no significant reduction in CRBSI (2.2%
525 versus 3.8%, OR 0.58, 95% CI: 0.29–1.14, P = 0.11) [157].
526 Although data regarding the use of a chlorhexidine impregnated sponge in
527 children are limited, one randomized, controlled study involving 705 neonates reported a
528 substantial decrease in colonized catheters in infants in the chlorhexidine sponge group
529 compared with the group that had standard dressings (15% versus 24%; RR = 0.6; 95%
530 CI = 0.5--0.9), but no difference in the rates of CRBSI or BSI without a source.
531 Chlorhexidine impregnated sponges were associated with localized contact dermatitis in
532 infants of very low birth weight. In 98 neonates with very low birth weight, 15 (15%)
533 developed localized contact dermatitis; four (1.5%) of 237 neonates weighing >1,000 g
534 developed this reaction (p < 0.0001). Infants with gestational age <26 weeks who had
535 CVCs placed at age <8 days were at increased risk for having localized contact
536 dermatitis, whereas no infants in the control group developed this local reaction [22].

Patient Cleansing

Recommendation

Use a 2% chlorhexidine wash daily to reduce CRBSI [162]. Category II

Comment [JDS18]: For adults only?

Background

Daily cleansing of ICU patients with a 2% chlorhexidine impregnated washcloth may be a simple, effective strategy to decrease the rate of primary BSIs. In a single center study of 836 ICU patients, patients receiving the chlorhexidine intervention were significantly less likely to acquire a primary BSI (4.1 vs 10.4 infections per 1000 patient days; incidence difference, 6.3 [95% confidence interval, 1.2-11.0) than those bathed with soap and water [162].

Catheter Securement Devices

Recommendation

Use a sutureless securement device to reduce the risk of infection for PICCs [163].

Category II

Background

Catheter stabilization is recognized as an intervention to decrease the risk for phlebitis, catheter migration and dislodgement, and may be advantageous in preventing CRBSIs. Pathogenesis of CRBSI occurs via migration of skin flora through the percutaneous entry site. Sutureless securement devices avoid disruption around the catheter entry site and may decrease the degree of bacterial colonization. [163]. Using a sutureless securement device also mitigates the risk of sharps injury to the healthcare personnel from inadvertent needlestick injury.

Deleted: u

Antimicrobial/Antiseptic Impregnated Catheters and Cuffs

Recommendation

Use a chlorhexidine/silver sulfadiazine or minocycline/rifampin -impregnated CVC in adults whose catheter is expected to remain in place >5 days if, after successful implementation of a comprehensive strategy to reduce rates of CRBSI, the CRBSI rate remains above the goal set by the individual institution based on benchmark rates (Tables 2 and 3) and local factors. The comprehensive strategy should include at least the following three components: educating persons who insert and maintain catheters, use of maximal sterile barrier precautions, and a 2% chlorhexidine preparation for skin antisepsis during CVC insertion. Category IA

Comment [jds19]: ? and less than 30 days

Background

Certain catheters and cuffs that are coated or impregnated with antimicrobial or antiseptic agents can decrease the risk for CRBSI and potentially decrease hospital costs associated with treating CRBSIs, despite the additional acquisition cost of an antimicrobial/antiseptic impregnated catheter [164]. Nearly all of the studies involving antimicrobial/antiseptic-impregnated catheters have been conducted using triple-lumen, uncuffed catheters in adult patients whose catheters remained in place <30 days. Most of the studies have been conducted in adults; however, these catheters have been approved by FDA for use in patients weighing >3 kg. Two non-randomized studies [165, 166] in pediatric ICU patients suggest that these catheters may reduce risk of catheter-associated infection. No antiseptic or antimicrobial impregnated catheters currently are available for use in infants weighing <3 kg.

Chlorhexidine/Silver sulfadiazine.

Catheters coated with chlorhexidine/silver sulfadiazine only on the external luminal surface have been studied as a means to reduce CRBSI. Two meta-analyses of first-generation catheters [1, 167] demonstrated that such catheters reduced the risk for CRBSI compared with standard non-coated catheters. The duration of catheter placement in one study ranged from 5.1 to 11.2 days [168]. A second-generation catheter is now available with chlorhexidine coating the internal surface extending into the extension set and hubs while the external luminal surface is coated with chlorhexidine and silver sulfadiazine. The external surface has three times the amount of chlorhexidine and extended release of the surface bound antiseptics than that in the first generation catheters. All three prospective, randomized studies of second-generation catheters demonstrated a significant reduction in catheter colonization, but they were underpowered to show a difference in CRBSI [169-171]. Prolonged anti-infective activity provides improved efficacy in preventing infections [172]. Although rare, anaphylaxis with the use of these chlorhexidine/silver sulfadiazine catheters has been observed [173-176].

Chlorhexidine/silver sulfadiazine catheters are more expensive than standard catheters. However, one analysis has suggested that the use of chlorhexidine/silver sulfadiazine catheters should lead to a cost savings of $68 to $391 per catheter [177] in settings in which the risk for CRBSI is high, despite adherence to other preventive strategies (e.g., maximal barrier precautions and aseptic techniques). Use of these catheters might be cost effective in ICU patients, burn patients, neutropenic patients, and other patient populations in which the rate of infection exceeds 3.3 per 1,000 catheter days [168].

Comment [jds20]: How was 3.3/1,000 derived? I think this is outdated with the more recent lower rates associated with bundled practices.

Minocycline/Rifampin.

In a multicenter randomized trial, CVCs impregnated on both the external and internal surfaces with minocycline/rifampin were associated with lower rates of CRBSI when compared with the first generation chlorhexidine/silver sulfadiazine impregnated catheters [178]. The beneficial effect began after day 6 of catheterization. Silicone minocycline/rifampin impregnated CVCs with an average dwell time of over 60 days have been shown to be effective in reducing CRBSI [179]. No minocycline/rifampin-resistant organisms were reported. Two trials demonstrated that use of these catheters significantly reduced CRBSI compared to uncoated catheters [164, 179]. No comparative studies have been published using the second-generation chlorhexidine/ silver sulfadiazine catheter. Although there have been concerns related to the potential for development of resistance, several prospective clinical studies have shown that the risk is low [180, 181]. Further, no resistance to minocyline or rifampin related to the use of the catheter has been documented in the clinical setting. Two studies using decision model analysis revealed these catheters were associated with superior cost savings compared with first generation chlorhexidine/silver sulfadiazine catheters [182, 183]. Such analysis needs to be done compared to the second-generation catheters. However, as baseline rates of infection decrease and the cost of catheters decreases, the cost-benefit ratio will likely change.

The decision to use chlorhexidine/silver sulfadiazine or minocycline/rifampin impregnated catheters should be based on the need to enhance prevention of CRBSI after bundled standard procedures have been implemented and shown to be practiced consistently by auditing (e.g., educating personnel, using maximal sterile barrier precautions, and using 2% chlorhexidine skin antisepsis) and then

balanced against the concern for emergence of resistant pathogens and the cost of implementing this strategy.

Platinum/Silver

A combination platinum/silver impregnated catheter (i.e., a silver iontophoretic catheter) is available for use in the United States. Several prospective, randomized studies have been published comparing these catheters to uncoated catheters [184-187]. One study showed a reduction in the incidence density of catheter colonization and CRBSI [186], but the other studies found no difference in catheter colonization or CRBSI between the impregnated catheter and a non-impregnated catheter [87, 184, 185].

Systemic Antibiotic Prophylaxis

Recommendation

Do not administer systemic antimicrobial prophylaxis routinely before insertion or during use of an intravascular catheter to prevent catheter colonization or CRBSI [188]**.**

Category IA

Background

Several studies have examined the role of systemic antibiotic prophylaxis in prevention of catheter-related infection. A recent meta-analysis reviewed these studies in oncology patients [188]. Four studies utilized a prophylactic glycopeptide prior to catheter insertion. However, heterogeneity in these studies precludes any conclusion from being reached about efficacy

In a study examining the effect of ongoing oral prophylaxis with rifampin and novobiocin on catheter-related infection in cancer patients treated with interleukin-2 [189], a reduction in CRBSI was observed, even though 9 of 26 subjects (35%)

discontinued the prophylactic antibiotics due to side effects or toxicity. In non-oncology patients, no benefit was associated with vancomycin administration prior to catheter insertion in 55 patients undergoing catheterization for parenteral nutrition [190]. Similarly, extending perioperative prophylactic antibiotics in cardiovascular surgery patients did not reduce central venous catheter colonization [191]. A recent Cochrane review of prophylactic antibiotics in neonates with umbilical venous catheters concluded that there is insufficient evidence from randomized trials to support or refute the use of prophylactic antibiotics [192].

Late onset neonatal sepsis is often due to coagulase negative staphylococci and is thought to frequently stem from infected central venous catheters. Five trials involved a total of 371 neonates treated with vancomycin, either by continuous infusion via parenteral nutrition or intermittent dosing or placebo. The infants treated with vancomycin experienced less nosocomial sepsis (RR 0.11; 95% CI 0.05-0.24) and less sepsis due to coagulase-negative staphylococci (RR 0.33; 95% CI 0.19-0.59) [193]. However, mortality and length of stay were not significantly different between the two groups. There were insufficient data to evaluate the risk of development of vancomycin-resistant organisms.

Antibiotic/Antiseptic Ointments

Recommendation

Use povidone iodine antiseptic ointment or bacitracin/neomycin/polymyxin B ointment at the hemodialysis catheter exit site after catheter insertion and at the end of each dialysis session only if this ointment does not interact with the material of the hemodialysis catheter per manufacturer's recommendation [139, 194-198]. Category IB

Background

A variety of topical antibiotic or antiseptic ointments have been utilized in attempts to lower the antimicrobial burden at the catheter insertion site and thus prevent infection. A number of older studies, examining primarily peripheral venous catheters, yielded varying conclusions [139, 199, 200]. In addition, the use of antibiotic ointments that have limited antifungal activity may serve to increase colonization and/or infection due to *Candida* spp [151].

More recent studies have examined this approach in high-risk patients, particularly those undergoing hemodialysis [194-197]. Three randomized, controlled trials have evaluated the use of 10% povidone iodine [195-197]. A significant decrease in colonization, exit-site infection, or bloodstream infection was observed. The beneficial effect was most prominent in subjects with nasal colonization by *S. aureus* [195-197].

Nasal carriers of *S. aureus* are more likely to experience a CRBSI than non-colonized persons [201-203]. This has prompted investigators to assess the utility of topical mupirocin, a potent anti-staphylococcal agent. Several studies have demonstrated a reduced risk of CRBSI when mupirocin ointment was applied at the catheter insertion site [195, 204-206]. Others have shown similar benefits when mupirocin was applied

691 intranasally [202, 203, 207]. However, enthusiasm for this measure has been dampened by
692 the rapid emergence of mupirocin resistance observed at some centers [150, 208, 209],
693 and the potential degrading effect that mupirocin has on polyurethane catheters [154,
694 155].

695 In the only study demonstrating a significant effect on mortality, the application
696 of bacitracin/neomycin/polymyxin B ointment at the catheter insertion site was compared
697 to placebo in 169 hemodialysis patients [210]. Infections were observed in more patients
698 in the placebo group than in the bacitracin/neomycin/polymyxin B group (34 versus 12%;
699 relative risk, 0.35; 95% CI, 0.18 to 0.68; P = 0.0013). The number of infections per 1,000
700 catheter days (4.10 versus 1.02; P < 0.0001) and the number of bacteremias per 1,000
701 catheter days (2.48 versus 0.63; P = 0.0004) were also greater in the placebo group.
702 Within the 6-month study period, there were 13 deaths in the placebo group as compared
703 with three deaths in the bacitracin/neomycin/polymyxin B group (P = 0.004). Thus, there
704 is evidence from one study in hemodialysis patients that bacitracin/neomycin/polymyxin
705 B ointment can improve outcome, but no similar data exist for other patient populations
706 [210].

707 **Antibiotic Lock Prophylaxis, Antimicrobial Catheter Flush and Catheter Lock**
708 **Prophylaxis**

709 **Recommendation**

710 Use prophylactic antimicrobial lock solution in patients with long term catheters who
711 have a history of multiple CRBSI despite optimal maximal adherence to aseptic
712 technique [23, 211-228]. Category II

Background

To prevent CRBSI, a wide variety of antibiotic and antiseptic solutions have been utilized to flush or lock catheter lumens [23, 211-228]. Catheter lock is a technique by which an antimicrobial solution is used to fill a catheter lumen and then allowed to dwell for a period of time while the catheter is idle. Antibiotics of various concentrations that have been used either alone (when directed at a specific organism) or in combination (to achieve broad empiric coverage) to prophylactically flush or lock central venous catheters include vancomycin, gentamicin, ciprofloxacin, minocycline, amikacin, cefazolin, cefotaxime, and ceftazidime; while antiseptics have included alcohol, taurolidine, trisodium citrate. (Taurolidine and trisodium citrate are not approved for this use in the US). These agents are usually combined with a compound acting as an anticoagulant, such as heparin or ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid (EDTA). Most of these studies have been conducted in relatively small numbers of high-risk patients, such as hemodialysis patients, neonates, or neutropenic oncology patients. Although most studies indicate a beneficial effect of the antimicrobial flush or lock solution in terms of prevention of catheter-related infection, this must be balanced by the potential for side effects, toxicity, allergic reactions, or emergence of resistance associated with the antimicrobial agent. The wide variety of compounds used, the heterogeneity of the patient populations studied, and limitations in the size or design of studies preclude a general recommendation for use. In addition, there are no FDA-approved formulations approved for marketing, and most formulations have been prepared in hospital pharmacies. A brief overview of some of the studies follows.

735 At least 10 studies regarding catheter flush or lock solutions have been performed
736 in hemodialysis patients [218, 219, 221-228]. Three meta-analyses have all demonstrated
737 that catheter lock solutions reduce risk of CRBSI in hemodialysis patients [229-231]. In
738 the largest of these studies, 291 subjects were enrolled in a prospective randomized
739 comparison of 30% trisodium citrate versus heparin [223]. The rate of CRBSI was
740 significantly lower in the group whose catheters were locked with trisodium citrate (4.1
741 BSI/1,000 CVC days vs. 1.1 BSI/1,000 CVC days, P< 0.001), and no significant
742 difference in thrombosis or occlusion of the catheter was noted. However, if infused
743 rapidly, concentrated citrate can result in serious hypocalcaemia, cardiac dysrhythmia,
744 and death. The second largest study in hemodialysis subjects examined the effect of a
745 catheter lock solution containing cefazolin, gentamicin, and heparin compared to control
746 patients receiving only heparin [225]. In 120 subjects, the rate of CRBSI was
747 significantly lower in those receiving the antibiotic lock solution (0.44 BSI/1,000 CVC
748 days vs. 3.12 BSI/1,000 CVC days, P=0.03) [225]. Other trials in hemodialysis patients
749 have studied minocycline, gentamicin, EDTA, heparin, taurolidine, vancomycin, and
750 cefotaxime.
751 At least five studies have been conducted in pediatric oncology patients [211, 212,
752 215-217]. In the largest trial, 126 subjects were enrolled in a prospective, randomized,
753 double blind study comparing vancomycin/ciprofloxacin/heparin (VCH) to
754 vancomycin/heparin (VH) to heparin (H) alone [215]. The time to CVC-related infection
755 was significantly longer in the VCH or VH arms of the study compared to heparin, and
756 the rate of possible or definite catheter-related infection was significantly lower with

757 either of the antibiotic containing solutions compared to heparin alone (1.72/1,000 CVC
758 days [H] vs. 0.55/1,000 CVC days [VCH] vs. 0.37/1,000 CVC days [VH]).

759 In a meta-analysis of seven randomized, controlled trials examining the utility of
760 vancomycin-containing lock or flush solutions compared to heparin alone, the risk ratio
761 for vancomycin/heparin solutions was 0.49 (95% CI 0.26-0.95, p = 0.03) [232]. Use of
762 the catheter lock technique appeared to have greater benefit than simply flushing
763 vancomycin through the catheter.

764 Recently, a prospective, double blind, randomized trial compared the utility of
765 70% ethanol lock versus heparinized saline for the prevention of CABSI in oncology
766 patients. Patients receiving the ethanol lock preventive therapy were significantly less
767 likely to experience a CABSI (0.60/1,000 CVC days vs. 3.11/1,000 CVC days; OR 0.18,
768 95% CI 0.05-0.65, p= 0.008) [233].

769 **Anticoagulants**

770 **Recommendation**

771 Do not routinely use anticoagulant therapy to reduce the risk of catheter-related infection
772 in general patient populations [234]. Category II

773 **Background**

774 Shortly after insertion, intravascular catheters are coated with a conditioning film,
775 consisting of fibrin, plasma proteins, and cellular elements, such as platelets and red
776 blood cells [27, 235]. Microbes interact with the conditioning film to result in
777 colonization of the catheter [236]. There is a close association between thrombosis of
778 central venous catheters and infection [35, 237, 238]. Therefore, anticoagulants have
779 been used to prevent catheter thrombosis and presumably reduce the risk of infection.

In a meta-analysis evaluating the benefit of heparin prophylaxis (3 units/mL in parenteral nutrition, 5,000 units every 6 or 12 hours flush or 2,500 units low molecular weight heparin subcutaneously) in patients with short-term CVCs, the risk for catheter-related central venous thrombosis was reduced with the use of prophylactic heparin [234]. However, no substantial difference in the rate of CRBSI was observed. In a more recent prospective, randomized trial, 204 patients with non-tunneled catheters were assigned to receive a continuous infusion of heparin (100 units/kg/d) or saline (50 mL/d) [239]. The rate of CRBSI was significantly decreased in the group receiving heparin (2.5 BSI/1,000 CVC days vs. 6.4 BSI/1,000 CVC days). Because the majority of heparin solutions contain preservatives with antimicrobial activity, whether any decrease in the rate of CRBSI is a result of the reduced thrombus formation, the preservative, or both is unclear.

The majority of pulmonary artery, umbilical, and central venous catheters are available as heparin-bonded devices. The majority of catheters are heparin bonded with benzalkonium, which provides the catheters with antimicrobial activity [240] and provides an anti-thrombotic effect [241]. However, some catheters have heparin bound directly to the catheter without benzalkonium [242]. Studies have shown that heparin-bonded catheters reduce risk of thrombosis and risk of CRBSI [239, 241-243]; but are less effective at reducing catheter colonization than catheters impregnated with chlorhexidine/silver sulfadiazine [244]. Unfortunately, heparin-induced thrombocytopenia can occur and has prompted many clinicians to avoid heparin [245].

Trisodium citrate has been recommended as a catheter lock solution because it possesses both anticoagulant and antimicrobial properties [223]. In a prospective, randomized,

double blind study in hemodialysis patients, use of interdialytic heparin (5,000 U/mL) was associated with a significantly greater rate of CRBSIs compared to use of 30% trisodium citrate (4.1 BSI/1,000 CVC days vs. 1.1BSI/1,000 CVC days [246].

Warfarin has been evaluated as a means to reduce CVC thrombus formation and, hence, infection [247-251]. However, other studies have not confirmed reduced thrombosis and others have found untoward interactions in patients receiving 5-FU [252, 253]. Data are quite limited; and although low dose warfarin decreases the risk of thrombus formation in cancer patients, it has not been shown to reduce infectious complications. Over 20% of patients in some studies develop prolonged prothrombin times and required dosage adjustment [254]. Other anticoagulants, such as factor Xa inhibitors or direct thrombin inhibitors, have not been adequately assessed in terms of reducing the risk of catheter-associated infection.

Replacement of Peripheral and Midline Catheters

Recommendations

1. Replace peripheral catheters every 72-96 hours to reduce risk of infection and phlebitis in adults. Category 1B

2. Replace peripheral catheters in children only when clinically indicated [82, 83]. Category 1B

2. Replace midline catheters only when there is a specific indication. Category II

Background

Scheduled replacement of intravascular catheters has been proposed as a method to prevent phlebitis and catheter-related infections. Studies of short peripheral venous catheters indicate that the incidence of thrombophlebitis and bacterial colonization of

826 catheters increases when catheters are left in place >72 hours [83, 255, 256]. However,
827 rates of phlebitis are not substantially different in peripheral catheters left in place 72
828 hours compared with 96 hours [257]. Because phlebitis and catheter colonization have
829 been associated with an increased risk for catheter-related infection, short peripheral
830 catheter sites commonly are replaced at 72-96 hour intervals to reduce both the risk for
831 infection and patient discomfort associated with phlebitis.

832 Midline catheters are associated with lower rates of phlebitis than short peripheral
833 catheters and with lower rates of infection than CVCs [258-260]. In one prospective
834 study of 140 midline catheters, their use was associated with a BSI rate of 0.8 per 1,000
835 catheter days [260]. No specific risk factors, including duration of catheterization, were
836 associated with infection. Midline catheters were in place a median of 7 days, but for as
837 long as 49 days. Although the findings of this study suggested that midline catheters
838 could be changed only when there is a specific indication, no prospective, randomized
839 studies have assessed the benefit of routine replacement as a strategy to prevent CRBSI
840 associated with midline catheters.

841 **Replacement of CVCs, Including PICCs and Hemodialysis Catheters**

842 **Recommendations**

843 1. Do not routinely replace CVCs, PICCs, hemodialysis catheters, or pulmonary artery
844 catheters to prevent catheter-related infections. Category IB

845 2. Do not remove CVCs or PICCs on the basis of fever alone. Use clinical judgment
846 regarding the appropriateness of removing the catheter if infection is evident elsewhere or
847 if a noninfectious cause of fever is suspected. Category II

Comment [jds21]: Suggest a statement about the importance of verifying that a CVL is truly a central line and not a midline re: fluids infused thru it and inclusion in denominator for CLABSIs.

Comment [jds22]: Suggest: remove CVL if fungemia develops; for bacterial infections, remove if persistanetly bacteremic or hemodynamically unstable without other source identified.

3. Do not use guidewire exchanges routinely for non-tunneled catheters to prevent infection. Category IB

4. Do not use guidewire exchanges to replace a non-tunneled catheter suspected of infection. Category IB

4. Use a guidewire exchange to replace a malfunctioning non-tunneled catheter if no evidence of infection is present. Category IB

5. Use new sterile gloves before handling the new catheter when guidewire exchanges are performed. Category II

Background

Catheter replacement at scheduled time intervals as a method to reduce CRBSI has not lowered rates. Two trials have assessed a strategy of changing the catheter every 7 days compared with a strategy of changing catheters as needed [261, 262]. One of these studies involved 112 surgical ICU patients needing CVCs, pulmonary artery catheters, or peripheral arterial catheters [262], whereas the other study involved only subclavian hemodialysis catheters [261]. In both studies, no difference in CRBSI was observed in patients undergoing scheduled catheter replacement every 7 days compared with patients whose catheters were replaced as needed.

Scheduled guidewire exchanges of CVCs are another proposed strategy for preventing CRBSI. The results of a meta-analysis of 12 randomized, controlled trials assessing CVC management failed to prove any reduction of CRBSI rates through routine replacement of CVCs by guidewire exchange compared with catheter replacement on an as needed basis [263]. Thus, routine replacement of CVCs is not necessary for catheters that are functioning and have no evidence of causing local or systemic complications.

Catheter replacement over a guidewire has become an accepted technique for replacing a malfunctioning catheter or exchanging a pulmonary artery catheter for a CVC when invasive monitoring no longer is needed. Catheter insertion over a guidewire is associated with less discomfort and a significantly lower rate of mechanical complications than are those percutaneously inserted at a new site [264]. In addition, this technique provides a means of preserving limited venous access in some patients. Replacement of temporary catheters over a guidewire in the presence of bacteremia is not an acceptable replacement strategy because the source of infection is usually colonization of the skin tract from the insertion site to the vein [25, 264]. However, in selected patients with tunneled hemodialysis catheters and bacteremia, catheter exchange over a guidewire, in combination with antibiotic therapy, is an alternative as a salvage strategy in patients with limited venous access [265-268].

Formatted: Highlight

Because of the increased difficulty obtaining vascular access in children, attention should be given to the frequency with which catheters are replaced in these patients. In a study in which survival analysis techniques were used to examine the relation between the duration of central venous catheterization and complications in pediatric ICU patients, all of the patients studied (n = 397) remained uninfected for a median of 23.7 days [121]. In addition, no relation was found between duration of catheterization and the daily probability of infection ($r = 0.21$; $p > 0.1$), suggesting that routine replacement of CVCs likely does not reduce the incidence of catheter-related infection [121].

Vascular access sites can be even more limited among neonates. Four randomized trials (n=368) summarized in a recent Cochrane Database Systemic Review compared the effects of giving parenteral nutrition through percutaneous central venous

catheters vs. peripheral intravenous catheters. Fewer painful procedures (venopunctures) were required in neonates randomized to percutaneously placed CVCs, and there was no evidence for increased risk of BSIs [269].

CVC occlusion due to thrombus formation is one of the most common reasons for CVC removal in neonates. Various methods have been tried to prevent catheter occlusion. Recently, a randomized trial (n=201) evaluated whether a continuous heparin infusion (0.5 units/kg/hour) could effectively prolong the duration of catheterization when compared to a placebo infusion. The rate of catheter occlusion requiring catheter removal was lower in the heparin group (6% vs. 31%, P=0.001: NNT=4). Rates of CRBSI were similar, although the study was not powered to evaluate CRBSI rate differences. Heparin associated antibody levels were not routinely measured [270].

Hemodialysis Catheters

The use of catheters for hemodialysis is the most common factor contributing to bacteremia in dialysis patients [271, 272]. The relative risk for bacteremia in patients with dialysis catheters is sevenfold the risk for patients with arteriovenous (AV) fistulas [273]. To reduce the rate of infection, hemodialysis catheters should be avoided in favor of AV fistulas and grafts. If temporary access is needed for dialysis, a cuffed catheter is preferable to a non-cuffed catheter, even in the ICU setting, if the catheter is expected to stay in place for >3 weeks [198].

Pulmonary Artery Catheters

Pulmonary artery catheters are inserted through a polytetrafluoroethylene introducer and typically remain in place an average of 3 days. The majority of pulmonary artery catheters are heparin bonded, which reduces not only catheter thrombosis but also

917 microbial adherence to the catheter [240]. Meta-analysis indicates that the CRBSI rate
918 associated with pulmonary artery catheterization is 3.7 per 1,000 catheter days and
919 somewhat higher than the rate observed for unmedicated and non-tunnelled CVCs (2.7
920 per 1,000 catheter days)[6, 93].

921 Data from prospective studies indicate that the risk of significant catheter
922 colonization and CRBSI increases the longer the catheter remains in place. In general, the
923 risk of significant catheter colonization increases after 4 days of catheterization [137,
924 274, 275], whereas the risk of CRBSI increases beyond 5-7 days of catheterization [137,
925 146, 276]. Efforts must be made to differentiate between infection related to the
926 introducer and that related to the pulmonary artery catheter. Significant colonization of
927 the introducer occurs earlier than that of the pulmonary artery catheter [274, 277].
928 However, no studies indicate that catheter replacement at scheduled time intervals is an
929 effective method to reduce CRBSI [262, 264, 277]. In patients who continue to require
930 hemodynamic monitoring, pulmonary artery catheters do not need to be changed more
931 frequently than every 7 days [277]. No specific recommendation can be made regarding
932 routine replacement of catheters that need to be in place for >7 days.

933 Pulmonary artery catheters are usually packaged with a thin plastic sleeve that
934 prevents touch contamination when placed over the catheter. In a study of 166 catheters,
935 patients who were randomly assigned to have their catheters self-contained within this
936 sleeve had a reduced risk for CRBSI compared with those who had a pulmonary artery
937 catheter placed without the sleeve ($p = 0.002$) [138].

938 **Umbilical Catheters**

939 **Recommendations**

1. Remove and do not replace umbilical artery catheters if any signs of CRBSI, vascular insufficiency, or thrombosis are present [278]. Category II

2. Remove and do not replace umbilical venous catheters if any signs of CRBSI or thrombosis are present [278]. Category II

3. No recommendation can be made for treating through an umbilical venous catheter suspected of being infected. Unresolved issue

4. Replace umbilical venous catheters only if the catheter malfunctions. Category II

5. Cleanse the umbilical insertion site with an antiseptic before catheter insertion. Avoid tincture of iodine because of the potential effect on the neonatal thyroid. Other iodine-containing products (e.g., povidone iodine) can be used [279-283]. Category IB

6. Do not use topical antibiotic ointment or creams on umbilical catheter insertion sites because of the potential to promote fungal infections and antimicrobial resistance [150, 151]. Category IA

7. Add low doses of heparin (0.25-1.0 U/ml) to the fluid infused through umbilical arterial catheters [284-286]. Category IB

8. Remove umbilical catheters as soon as possible when no longer needed or when any sign of vascular insufficiency to the lower extremities is observed. Optimally, umbilical artery catheters should not be left in place >5 days [278, 287]. Category II

9. Umbilical venous catheters should be removed as soon as possible when no longer needed, but can be used up to 14 days if managed aseptically [288, 289]. Category II

Background

Although the umbilical stump becomes heavily colonized soon after birth, umbilical vessel catheterization often is used for vascular access in newborn infants.

963 Umbilical vessels can be cannulated easily and permit both collection of blood samples
964 and measurement of hemodynamic status. The incidences of catheter colonization and
965 BSI are similar for umbilical vein catheters and umbilical artery catheters. In several
966 studies, an estimated 40%-55% of umbilical artery catheters were colonized and 5%
967 resulted in CRBSI; umbilical vein catheters were associated with colonization in 22%-
968 59% of cases [280, 281, 290] and with CRBSI in 3%-8% of cases [281]. Although
969 CRBSI rates are similar for umbilical catheters in the high position (i.e., above the
970 diaphragm) compared with the low position (i.e., below the diaphragm and above the
971 aortic bifurcation), catheters placed in the high position result in a lower incidence of
972 vascular complications without an increase in adverse sequelae [281].
973 Risk factors for infection differ for umbilical artery and umbilical vein catheters.
974 In one study, neonates with very low birth weight who also received antibiotics for >10
975 days were at increased risk for umbilical artery CRBSIs [281]. In comparison, those with
976 higher birth weight and receipt of parenteral nutrition fluids were at increased risk for
977 umbilical vein CRBSI. Duration of catheterization was not an independent risk factor for
978 infection of either type of umbilical catheter.
979 A recent randomized trial (n=210) evaluated whether long-term umbilical venous
980 catheterization (up to 28 days) would result in the same or fewer CABSIs when compared
981 with neonates who were randomized to short-term umbilical venous catheterization for 7-10
982 days followed by percutaneous central venous catheterization. CABSI rate was higher
983 (20%) among long term catheterized neonates when compared to short term catheterized
984 neonates (13%). The difference was not statistically significant (P=0.17), although the
985 study was underpowered to evaluate differences in venous thrombosis rates [291].

Deleted: to

Peripheral Arterial Catheters and Pressure Monitoring Devices for Adult and Pediatric Patients

Recommendations

1. In adults, use of the radial, brachial or dorsalis pedis sites is preferred over the femoral or axillary sites of insertion to reduce the risk of infection [94, 95, 292, 293]. Category IB

2. In children, the brachial site should not be used. The radial, dorsalis pedis, and posterior tibial sites are preferred over the femoral or axillary sites of insertion [94]. Category II

3. A cap, mask, sterile gloves and a large sterile fenestrated drape should be used during peripheral arterial catheter insertion [95, 293]. Category IB

4. During axillary or femoral artery catheter insertion, maximal sterile barriers precautions should be used. Category II

5. Replace arterial catheters only when there is a clinical indication. Category II

6. Remove the arterial catheter as soon as it is no longer needed. Category II

7. Use disposable, rather than reusable, transducer assemblies when possible [294-298]. Category IB

8. Do not routinely replace arterial catheters to prevent catheter-related infections [262, 276, 299, 300]. Category II

9. Replace disposable or reusable transducers at 96-hour intervals. Replace other components of the system (including the tubing, continuous-flush device, and flush solution) at the time the transducer is replaced [25, 295]. Category IB

10. Keep all components of the pressure monitoring system (including calibration devices and flush solution) sterile [294, 301-303]. Category IA

Formatted: Highlight

11. Minimize the number of manipulations of and entries into the pressure monitoring system. Use a closed flush system (i.e., continuous flush), rather than an open system (i.e., one that requires a syringe and stopcock), to maintain the patency of the pressure monitoring catheters [297, 304]. Category II

12. When the pressure monitoring system is accessed through a diaphragm, rather than a stopcock, wipe the diaphragm with an appropriate antiseptic before accessing the system [297]. Category IA

13. Do not administer dextrose-containing solutions or parenteral nutrition fluids through the pressure monitoring circuit [297, 305, 306]. Category IA

14. Sterilize reusable transducers according to the manufacturers' instructions if the use of disposable transducers is not feasible [297, 305-308]. Category IA

Background

Peripheral arterial catheters are usually inserted into the radial or femoral artery and permit continuous blood pressure monitoring and blood gas measurements. The rate of CRBSI is lower than that of short term, uncuffed, non-coated, non-tunneled CVCs (1.7 versus 2.7 per 1,000 catheter days)[6]. However, CRBSI rates are comparable between arterial catheters and short term, uncuffed, medicated, non-tunneled CVCs [6]. Unlike CVCs, use of full barrier precautions during arterial cannulaton does not appear to reduce the risk of arterial CRBSI [293, 309]. Nonetheless, when arterial catheters are inserted using a protocol which includes maximum barrier precautions, a very low rate of CRBSI (0.41/1,000 catheter days) can be achieved[95]. Although a meta-analysis failed to discern a difference in rates of CRBSI among three sites of insertion (radial, femoral, and axillary)[310], colonization of catheters inserted in the femoral site occurs more often

Formatted: Highlight

[293]. In addition, a prospective observational study of over 2,900 arterial catheters that were inserted using maximum barrier precautions demonstrated an almost 8-fold increase in the incidence of CRBSI when the femoral site was used compared to the radial site[311]. Furthermore, there is a greater risk of CRBSI caused by Gram-negative bacteria when the femoral site is utilized [311]. The rates of catheter colonization and CRBSI appear similar between the radial and dorsalis pedis sites[292]. The risk of developing a CRBSI increases with the duration of catheterization [276, 312]; however, the routine changing of arterial catheters at scheduled times does not result in a diminution of the rate of CRBSI [262]. Catheters that need to be in place for >5 days should not be routinely changed if no evidence of infection is observed.

Replacement of Administration Sets

Recommendations

1. In patients not receiving blood, blood products or lipid emulsions, replace administration sets, including secondary sets and add-on devices, no more frequently than at 96-hour intervals, [313] but at least every 7 days [255, 314-316]. Category IA
2. Replace tubing used to administer blood, blood products, or lipid emulsions (those combined with amino acids and glucose in a 3-in-1 admixture or infused separately) within 24 hours of initiating the infusion [317-320]. Category IB
3. Replace tubing used to administer propofol infusions every 6 or 12 hours, when the vial is changed, per the manufacturer's recommendation (FDA website Medwatch) [321]. Category IA

Background

The optimal interval for routine replacement of IV administration sets has been examined in a number of well-controlled studies and meta-analyses. Data from these studies reveal that replacing administration sets no more frequently than 72-96 hours after initiation of use is safe and cost-effective [255, 257, 313, 315, 316]. More recent studies suggest that administration sets may be used safely for up to 7 days if used in conjunction with antiseptic catheters or if fluids that enhance microbial growth (e.g., parenteral nutrition or blood) have not been used [30, 322]. When a fluid that enhances microbial growth is infused (e.g., lipid emulsions and blood products), more frequent changes of administration sets are indicated as these products have been identified as independent risk factors for CRBSI [30, 317, 323-327].

Needleless Intravascular Catheter Systems

Recommendations

1. Change the needleless components at least as frequently as the administration set. There is no benefit to changing these more frequently than every 72 hours [87, 328-334]. Category II

2. Change caps no more frequently than every 72 hours for the purpose of reduced infection rates or according to manufacturers' recommendations[328, 330, 333, 334]. Category II

3. Ensure that all components of the system are compatible to minimize leaks and breaks in the system[335]. Category II

Comment [JDS23]: More discussion on cap changes is needed, e.g., before obtaining blood cultures, frequency with TPN with/without lipids, propofol, etc.

4. Minimize contamination risk by wiping the access port with an appropriate antiseptic (chlorhexidine preferred) and accessing the port only with sterile devices [330, 333, 335]. Category IA

5. Use a needleless system to access IV tubing. Category IC

6. When needleless systems are used, the split septum valve is preferred over the mechanical valve due to increased risk of infection [336-339]. Category II

Background

Stopcocks used for injection of medications, administration of IV infusions, and collection of blood samples represent a potential portal of entry for microorganisms into vascular access catheters and IV fluids. Stopcock contamination is common, occurring in 45% and 50% in the majority of series. Whether such contamination is a substantial entry point of CRBSI has been difficult to prove. Nonetheless, stopcocks should be capped when not being used.

"Piggyback" systems are used as an alternative to stopcocks. However, they also pose a risk for contamination of the intravascular fluid if the device entering the rubber membrane of an injection port is exposed to air or comes into direct contact with nonsterile tape used to fix the needle to the port. Modified piggyback systems have the potential to prevent contamination at these sites [340].

Attempts to reduce the incidence of sharp injuries and the resultant risk for transmission of bloodborne infections to healthcare personnel have led to the design and introduction of needleless infusion systems. There are several types of needleless connectors commercially available.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [JDS24]: Please add citations here.

Comment [JDS25]: Shouldn't this be included as a specific recommendation?

Deleted: on the market.

The first type of needleless system connectors consisted of a split septum cap, which is accessed with a blunt cannula instead of a needle. Because of the large amount of space in the hub to accommodate the cannula, blood can easily backup into this space and occlude the catheter. A luer-activated device, which incorporates a valve preventing the outflow of fluid through the connector, was designed to eliminate this problem. Some luer devices require a cap to be attached to the valve when not in use, which can be difficult to maintain aseptically, and therefore they may be prone to contamination.

Another type of second-generation needleless system addressed the occlusion issue by incorporating positive pressure or neutral displacement to either flush out aspirated blood or prevent its aspiration into infusion catheters. However, with the positive pressure the risk of occlusion may actually rise, as the valves are held open, allowing retrograde blood flow into the catheters.

Many studies have shown that when the devices are used according to manufacturers' recommendations (i.e., appropriate disinfection prior to access), they do not substantially affect the incidence of CRBSI [328-335]. Use of "second-generation" needleless connectors or positive pressure mechanical valves, which reduce the backflow of blood after it is disengaged, appear to be effective in reducing hub colonization in some [341-343], but not all studies [344]. In one study [341], the incidence of CRBSI was reduced when the needleless connector was compared to standard stopcocks. Appropriate disinfectants must be used to prevent transmission of microbes through connectors [345]. Disinfection of the devices with chlorhexidine/alcohol solutions appears to be most effective in reducing colonization [342]. However, reports continue

to be published of outbreaks of CRBSI, even when the second-generation connectors are used [336-339]. The physical and mechanical properties of second-generation connectors vary widely from device to device. Potential explanations for outbreaks associated with these devices include difficulty encountered in adequate disinfection of the surface of the connector due to physical characteristics of the plastic housing diaphragm interface, fluid flow properties (laminar vs. turbulent), internal surface area, potential fluid dead space, inadequate flushing of the device due to poor visualization of the fluid flow pathway in opaque devices, and the presence of internal corrugations that could harbor organisms, particularly if the catheters are used to access blood [338]. Additionally, a silver coated connector valve has been approved for marketing. However, there are no published randomized trials with this device and no recommendation can be made regarding its use. Likewise, an antiseptic-barrier cap has been studied in a laboratory setting and appears to be effective in preventing the entry of microorganisms [346], but has not yet been studied in a clinical trial.

Multidose Parenteral Medication Vials and Parenteral Fluids

Recommendations

1. Mix all routine parenteral fluids in the pharmacy in a laminar flow hood using aseptic technique [347, 348]. Category IB
2. Do not use any container of parenteral fluid that has visible turbidity, leaks, cracks, particulate matter, or if the manufacturer's expiration date has passed [348]. Category IB
3. Use single dose vials for parenteral additives or medications when possible [348, 349]. Category II

4. Do not combine the leftover content of single use vials for later use [348, 349].

Category IA

5. If multidose vials are used, refrigerate multidose vials after they are opened if recommended by the manufacturer [348]. Category II

6. Cleanse the access diaphragm of multidose vials with 70% alcohol before inserting a device into the vial [350]. Category IA

7. Use a sterile device to access a multidose vial and avoid touch contamination of the device before penetrating the access diaphragm [351, 352]. Category IA

8. Discard multidose vial if sterility is compromised [351, 352]. Category IA

9. All multidose vials should be dated when 1st used and thereafter not used beyond the manufacturer's stated expiration period. Category IC

10. Use the needle and syringe to access the multidose vial only once and to then discard both safely. This applies to each and every dose withdrawn from the vial [351, 352]. Category IA

11. Complete the infusion of lipid-containing solutions (e.g., 3-in-1 solutions) within 24 hours of hanging the solution [317, 318, 326, 327, 353]Category IB

12. Complete the infusion of lipid emulsions alone within 12 hours of hanging the emulsion. If volume considerations require more time, the infusion should be completed within 24 hours [317, 326, 327]. Category IB

13. Complete infusions of blood or other blood products within 4 hours of hanging the blood[354-357]. Category II

14. No recommendation can be made for the hang time of other parenteral fluids.

Unresolved issue

Background

Parenteral medications commonly are dispensed in multidose, parenteral medication vials that might be used for prolonged periods for one or more patients. Although the overall risk for extrinsic contamination of multidose vials is likely minimal [358], the consequences of contamination might result in life threatening infection [359-361]}.Risk of contamination must be minimized by using one needle and one syringe one time only. Simply changing the needle and using the same syringe to access the vial is an unacceptable practice. Single use vials are intended for single use only (one puncture). They are frequently preservative free and pose a risk for contamination if they are punctured several times. This is particularly true with propofol, a drug that readily supports the growth of bacteria once contaminated.

Performance Improvement

Recommendation

Use hospital-specific or collaborative-based performance improvement initiatives in which multifaceted strategies are "bundled" together improve compliance with evidence-based recommended practices [61, 108, 109, 362-366]. Category 1B

Background

Clinical decision makers, healthcare payers, and patient safety advocates emphasize the importance of translating research findings into everyday practice. Rigorous evaluations of CRBSI preventive practices using study designs with high internal validity and including study populations that optimize external validity remain necessary. Once practices have been determined to be effective and economically efficient, the next step is to implement these evidence-based practices so they become

part of routine clinical care. Unfortunately, the use of evidence-based CRBSI preventive practices in U.S. hospitals remains suboptimal [367, 368]. In a national survey conducted in March 2005 of over 700 U.S. hospitals, approximately one quarter of U.S. hospitals indicated that either maximal sterile barrier precautions during central line insertion or chlorhexidine gluconate as site disinfectant, two practices widely recommended to prevent CRBSI, were not being used routinely [369]. Approximately 15% of U.S. hospitals reported routinely changing CVCs to prevent infection despite evidence that this practice should no longer be used [368, 369].

Accordingly, investigators have attempted various approaches to better translate research findings and evidence-based recommendations into clinical practice. Numerous quality improvement studies have been published during the past several years that have used various methods, such as education of healthcare personnel, audit and feedback, organizational change, and clinical reminders [54-57, 108, 109, 363, 370-372]. The educational interventions, for example, primarily targeted hand hygiene, use of maximal sterile barriers during insertion, appropriate insertion site selection, proper site care using chlorhexidine gluconate, and prompt removal of unnecessary catheters. While a large number of before-and-after studies with a few using concurrent control groups [61, 109] have been published, no randomized, controlled trial evaluating a quality improvement strategy to prevent CRBSI has been reported [373]. The vast majority of before-and-after studies reported statistically significant decreases in CRBSI rates after a quality improvement strategy was implemented [373]. Additionally, both controlled trials also found statistically significant reductions of CRBSI in the intervention units compared to control units [61, 109].

Investigators have also employed multifaceted approaches in which several strategies are bundled together to improve compliance with evidence-based guidelines [61, 108, 109]. One such collaborative cohort study [108] of 108 ICUs in Michigan targeted clinicians' use of five evidence-based practices: hand hygiene, maximum barrier precautions, chlorhexidine site disinfection, avoiding the femoral site, and removing unnecessary central venous catheters. In addition to educating clinicians about CRBSI prevention, interventions used included: 1) a central venous catheter cart that contained all the necessary supplies; 2) a checklist to ensure adherence to proper practices; 3) stoppage of procedures in non-emergent situations, if evidence-based practices were not being followed; 4) prompt removal of central catheters during daily patient rounds; 5) feedback to the clinical teams regarding the number of CRBSI episodes and overall rates; and 6) buy-in from the chief executive officers of the participating hospitals that chlorhexidine gluconate products/solutions would be stocked prior to study initiation. Using an interrupted time series design and multivariable regression, the investigators reported a statistically significant 66% decrease in CRBSI rates approximately 18 months after the intervention began [108]. Specific process and outcome measures for tracking and feedback (i.e. rate of central line infections, proportion of central lines placed with all or individual bundle elements performed AND documented) should be identified in individual institutions based on areas that have been identified for performance improvement.

Comment [JDS26]: This generally does not occur *during* rounds, but rather the decision is made during rounds.

Finally, emphasis on the care and maintenance of catheters once they are in place should be a focus of performance improvement and quality assurance in all programs. A study to assess practice and staff knowledge of CVC post-insertion care and identify

1231 aspects of CVC care with potential for improvement revealed several areas of opportunity
1232 to improve post-insertion care [374]. Rates of breaches in catheter care and CRBSIs
1233 were calculated and statistical significance assumed when P<0.05. Data were recorded
1234 from 151 CVCs in 106 patients giving a total of 721 catheter days. In all, 323 breaches in
1235 care were identified giving a failure rate of 44.8%, with significant differences between
1236 intensive care unit (ICU) and non-ICU wards (P<0.001). Dressings (not intact) and caps
1237 and taps? (incorrectly placed) were identified as the major lapses in CVC care with 158
1238 and 156 breaches per 1000 catheter days, respectively. Interventions to improve
1239 reliability of care should focus on making the implementation of best practice easier to
1240 achieve.
1241
1242

Formatted: Highlight

General comments:

1) **We are disappointed that this guideline does not address clinical situations that we currently struggle with (e.g., cap changes related to blood culture draws; care of implanted cvls (ports); ecmo catheters; intra-atrial catheters).**

2) **We would like to see a more comprehensive discussion of CLABSI risk factors that would include ostomies, trachs, or any potential contamination with body fluids.**

3) **No information provided related to line insertion carts, cap change kits, or dressing change kits as adjunctive measures to prevent CLABSIs.**

4) **Since the title implies that these guidelines would be applicable to the care of central lines outside of acute care hospitals, would like to see more guidance for standardization of catheter care by home health agencies.**

5) **Use active voice for all recommendations. Some are inconsistent.**

6) **Do not see the need to have the recommendations duplicated in the text.**

7) **Would like to see more discussion of the bundled practices, the daily goal sheet, auditing insertion and maintenance practices. Might even include auditing in interventional radiology and in the O.R.Sometimes the recs and the ratings are**

more definitive than expected when reading the background discussion that presents conflicting data (e.g. for use of maximal sterile barrrier precautions.)

Table 1. Catheters used for venous and arterial access.

Catheter Type	Entry Site	Length	Comments
Peripheral venous catheters	usually inserted in veins of forearm or hand	less than 3 inches	phlebitis with prolonged use; rarely associated with bloodstream infection
Peripheral arterial catheters	usually inserted in radial artery; can be placed in femoral, axillary, brachial, posterior tibial arteries	less than 3 inches	low infection risk
Midline catheters	inserted via the antecubital fossa into the proximal basilic or cephalic veins	3 to 8 inches	anaphylactoid reactions have been reported with catheters made of elastomeric hydrogel; does not enter central veins; lower rates of phlebitis than short peripheral catheters
Nontunneled central venous catheters	percutaneously inserted into central veins (subclavian, internal jugular, or femoral)	8 cm or longer depending on patient size	account for majority of CRBSI
Pulmonary artery	inserted through a Polytetrafluoroethylene usually heparin bonded; similar introducer in a central vein (subclavian, internal jugular, or femoral)	depending on patient size	30 cm or longer rates of bloodstream infection as CVC; subclavian site preferred to reduce infection risk
Peripherally inserted central venous catheters(PICC)	inserted into basilic, cephalic or brachial veins and enter the superior vena cava	20 cm or longer depending on patient size	lower rate of infection than nontunneled CVCs
Tunneled central venous catheters	implanted into subclavian, internal jugular or femoral veins	8 cm or longer depending on patient size	cuff inhibits migration of organisms into catheter tract; lower rate of infection than nontunnelled CVC
Totally implantable devices	tunneled beneath skin and have subcutaneous port accessed with a needle; implanted in subclavian or internal jugular vein	8 cm or longer depending on patient size	lowest risk for CRBSI; improved patient self-image; no need for local catheter site care; surgery required for catheter removal
Umbilical catheters	inserted into either umbilical	6 cm or less, depending on patient size	risk for CRBSI similar with

vein or umbilical artery on patient size catheters placed in umbilical vein vs. artery

TABLE 2. Pooled means and key percentile of the distribution of central-line associated bloodstream in infection rates among hospitals participating in the National Healthcare Safety Network, CDC, 2006 –2007. [15]

Type of Intensive care Unit	No. Units	No. CABSIs	Catheter-days	Pooled mean/ 1,000 catheter-days	Percentile				
					10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
Burn	22	239	42452	5.6	0	1.5	3.8	8.2	13.5
Coronary	121	373	181079	2.1	0	0	1.3	2.8	5.3
Surgical cardiothoracic	97	397	275194	1.4	0	0	1.2	1.9	3.4
Medical	144	1073	454839	2.4	0	0.6	1.9	3.6	5.3
Medical/surgical Major teaching	104	692	342214	2.0	0	0.5	1.5	3.0	4.2
Med/Surg All others	343	972	662489	1.5	0	0	0.6	2.0	3.6
Pediatric medical/surgical	71	404	140,848	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.1	3.8	6.0
Neurologic	15	31	25440	1.2	-	-	-	-	-
Neurosurgical	39	173	68550	2.5	0	0	1.9	3.8	6.2
Surgical	128	881	383126	2.3	0	0.5	1.7	3.1	5.1
Trauma	32	435	107620	4.0	0.3	1.5	4.0	5.7	7.7
Inpatient medical ward	40	111	60257	1.8	0	0	0	2.2	3.4
Inpatient medical/surgical ward	82	169	132133	1.3	0	0	0	1.6	4.0

1317
1318

Table 3. Pooled means and key percentiles for the distribution of central-line associated bloodstream infection rates for level III NICUs, NHSH, CDC, 2006-2007.[15]

Comment [JDS27]: There are 2 Table 3s.

Birth-weight category	No. units	No. CLABSI	Central line-days	Pooled mean	Percentile				
					10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
< 750 g	82	225	60850	3.7	0.0	0.0	2.3	4.9	9.0
751-1000 g	84	185	55445	3.3	0.0	0.0	2.4	4.5	7.3
1001-1500 g	83	144	55874	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.6	3.6	6.1
1501-2500 g	71	105	44402	2.4	0.0	0.0	1.1	3.3	6.0
>2500 g	61	87	42611	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	5.4

1323
1324

TABLE 3. Most common pathogens isolated from nosocomial bloodstream infections, SCOPE. [16, 17]

	Percentage of BSIs		
Pathogen	Total	ICU	Non-ICU
Coagulase-negative staphylococci	31.3	35.9	26.6
Staphylococcus aureus	20.2	16.8	23.7
Enterococcus spp.	9.4	9.8	9.0
Candida spp.	9.0	10.1	7.9
Gram-negative rods			
Escherichia coli	5.6	3.7	7.6
Klebsiella spp	4.8	4.0	5.5
Enterobacter spp.	4.3	4.7	3.8
Pseudomonas aeruginosa	3.9	4.7	3.1
Acinetobacter baumannii	1.7	2.1	1.3
Serratia spp.	1.3	1.6	0.9

1328

1329

Appendix B. Disclosure of financial interests or relationships.

Naomi P. O'Grady, M.D.: No disclosures

Mary Alexander, R.N.: No Disclosures

Lillian A.Burns, M.T., M.P.H., C.I.C.

E. Patchen Dellinger, M.D.

Jeffery Garland, M.D.

Stephen O. Heard, M.D.: Merck advisory board; Angiotech advisory board: Honororia from Lippencott Wilkins and Williams;

Pamela A. Lipsett, M.D.: No disclosures

Henry Masur, M.D.:

Leonard A. Mermel, D.O., Sc.M.

Michele L. Pearson, M.D.:

Issam I. Raad, M.D.

Adrienne Randolph, M.D., M.Sc.

Mark E. Rupp, M.D.

Sanjay Saint, M.D., M.P.H.

Appendix C. Summary Recommendations

Strategies for Prevention of Catheter-Related Infections in Adult and Pediatric Patients

Education, training and staffing

Recommendations

1. Educate healthcare personnel regarding the indications for intravascular catheter use, proper procedures for the insertion and maintenance of intravascular catheters, and appropriate infection control measures to prevent intravascular catheter-related infections [53-61]. Category IA

2. Periodically assess knowledge of and adherence to guidelines for all persons who are involved in the insertion and maintenance of intravascular catheters [53-61]. Category IA

3. Designate only trained personnel who demonstrate competence for the insertion and maintenance of peripheral and central intravascular catheters. [60-74]. Category IA

4. Ensure appropriate nursing staff levels in ICUs to minimize the incidence of catheter-related BSIs. Observational studies suggest a ratio of 2:1 in ICUs where nurses are managing patients with CVCs [75-77]. Category IB

Site selection

Recommendations for peripheral catheters and midline catheters

1. In adults, use an upper-extremity site for catheter insertion. Replace a catheter inserted in a lower extremity site to an upper extremity site as soon as possible [82, 83]. Category IB

2. In pediatric patients, the upper or lower extremities or the scalp can be used as the catheter insertion site [82, 83]. Category II

3. Select catheters on the basis of the intended purpose and duration of use, known infectious and non-infectious complications (e.g., phlebitis and infiltration), and experience of individual catheter operators [83-85]. Category IB

4. Avoid the use of steel needles for the administration of fluids and medication that might cause tissue necrosis, if extravasation occurs [83-85]. Category IA

5. Use a midline catheter or peripherally inserted central catheter (PICC), instead of a short peripheral catheter, when the duration of IV therapy will likely exceed six days [83-85]. Category IB

Recommendations for central venous catheters

6. Weigh the risk and benefits of placing a central venous device at a recommended site to reduce infectious complications against the risk for mechanical complications (e.g., pneumothorax, subclavian artery puncture, subclavian vein laceration, subclavian vein stenosis, hemothorax, thrombosis, air embolism, and catheter misplacement) [25, 86-101]. Category IA

7. Use a subclavian site, rather than a jugular or a femoral site, in adult patients to minimize infection risk for nontunneled CVC placement [25, 99, 100]. Category IA

8. No recommendation can be made for a preferred site of insertion to minimize infection risk for a tunneled CVC. Unresolved issue

9. Place catheters used for hemodialysis and pheresis in a jugular or femoral vein, rather than a subclavian vein, to avoid venous stenosis [101-105]. Category IA

10. Use ultrasound guidance to place central venous catheters to reduce the number of cannulation attempts and mechanical complications if this technology is available [106, 107]. Category 1B

11. Promptly remove any intravascular catheter that is no longer essential [108, 109]. Category IA

Hand Hygiene and Aseptic Technique

Recommendations

1. Perform hand hygiene procedures, either by washing hands with conventional antiseptic containing soap and water or with waterless alcohol-based hand rubs (ABHR). Hand hygiene should be performed before and after palpating catheter insertion sites as well as before and after inserting, replacing, accessing, repairing, or dressing an intravascular catheter. Palpation of the insertion site should not be performed after the application of antiseptic, unless aseptic technique is maintained [58, 127-131]. Category IA

2. Maintain aseptic technique for the insertion and care of intravascular catheters [25, 132-134]. Category IA

3. Wear clean gloves, rather than sterile gloves, for the insertion of peripheral intravascular catheters, if the access site is not touched after the application of skin antiseptics. Category IC

4. Wear sterile gloves for the insertion of arterial, central, and midline catheters [25, 132-134]; and these gloves should be changed, if a catheter is being exchanged over a guidewire (thereby contaminating the gloves) and a new sterile catheter is then handled. Category IA

Deleted: S

Deleted: should be worn

4. Wear either clean or sterile gloves when changing the dressing on intravascular catheters. Category IC

Maximal Sterile Barrier Precautions

Recommendations

1. Use maximal sterile barrier precautions, including the use of a cap, mask, sterile gown, sterile gloves, and a large sterile full body drape, for the insertion of CVCs, PICCs, or guidewire exchange [60, 132, 136, 137]. Category IB

Comment [JDS28]: ? and peripheral arterial catheters

2. Use a sterile sleeve to protect pulmonary artery catheters during insertion [138]. Category IB

Skin Preparation

Recommendations

1. Prepare clean skin with 70% alcohol before peripheral venous catheter insertion [139]. Category IA

2. Prepare clean skin site with a 2% chlorhexidine-based preparation before central venous catheter insertion and during dressing changes. If there is a contraindication to chlorhexidine, tincture of iodine, an iodophor, or 70% alcohol can be used as alternatives [140, 141]. Category IA

3. No recommendation can be made for the safety or efficacy of chlorhexidine in infants aged <2 months. Unresolved issue

4. Allow povidone iodine to remain on the skin for at least 2 minutes or longer for the antibacterial properties to take effect, if it is not yet dry before catheter insertion. The antibacterial properties of chlorhexidine work on contact, and chlorhexidine does not

require a minimum 2- minute drying time before proceeding. Catheter insertion may begin as soon as the chlorhexidine is dry[140, 141]. Category IB

Catheter site dressing regimens

Recommendations

1. Use either sterile gauze or sterile, transparent, semi-permeable dressing to cover the catheter site [146-149]. Category IA

2. If the patient is diaphoretic or if the site is bleeding or oozing, use gauze dressing until this is resolved [146-149]. Category II

3. Replace catheter site dressing if the dressing becomes damp, loosened, or visibly soiled [146, 147]. Category IB

4. Do not use topical antibiotic ointment or creams on insertion sites, except for dialysis catheters, because of their potential to promote fungal infections and antimicrobial resistance [150, 151]. Category IB

5. Do not submerge the catheter or catheter site in water. Showering should be permitted if precautions can be taken to reduce the likelihood of introducing organisms into the catheter (e.g., if the catheter and connecting device are protected with an impermeable cover during the shower) [152, 153]. Category II

6. Replace dressings used on short-term CVC sites every 2 days for gauze dressings and at least every 7 days for transparent dressings, except in those pediatric patients in which the risk for dislodging the catheter may outweigh the benefit of changing the dressing [149]. Category IB

7. Replace dressings used on tunneled or implanted CVC sites no more than once per week, until the insertion site has healed [149]Category IB

8. No recommendation can be made regarding the necessity for any dressing on well-healed exit sites of long-term cuffed and tunneled CVCs. Unresolved issue

9. Ensure that catheter site care is compatible with the catheter material [154, 155]. Category IB

10. Use a sterile sleeve for all pulmonary artery catheters [138]. Category IB

11. Use a chlorhexidine-impregnated sponge dressing for temporary short-term catheters in patients older than 2 months of age, if the CRBSI rate is higher than the institutional goal, despite adherence to basic CRBSI prevention measures, including education and training, use of chlorhexidine for skin antisepsis, and MSB [22, 156-158]. Category 1B

Patient Cleansing

Recommendation

Use a 2% chlorhexidine wash daily to reduce CRBSI [162]. Category II

Catheter Securement Devices

Recommendation

Use a sutureless securement device to reduce the risk of infection for PICCs [163]. Category II

Antimicrobial/Antiseptic Impregnated Catheters and Cuffs

Recommendation

Use a chlorhexidine/silver sulfadiazine or minocycline/rifampin -impregnated CVC in adults whose catheter is expected to remain in place >5 days if, after successful implementation of a comprehensive strategy to reduce rates of CRBSI, the CRBSI rate remains above the goal set by the individual institution based on benchmark rates (Tables 2 and 3) and local factors. The comprehensive strategy should include at least the

following three components: educating persons who insert and maintain catheters, use of maximal sterile barrier precautions, and a 2% chlorhexidine preparation for skin antisepsis during CVC insertion. Category IA

Systemic Antibiotic Prophylaxis

Recommendation

Do not administer systemic antimicrobial prophylaxis routinely before insertion or during use of an intravascular catheter to prevent catheter colonization or CRBSI [188]**.**

Category IA

Antibiotic Lock Prophylaxis, Antimicrobial Catheter Flush and Catheter Lock Prophylaxis

Recommendation

Use prophylactic antimicrobial lock solution in patients with long term catheters who have a history of multiple CRBSI despite optimal maximal adherence to aseptic technique [23, 211-228]. Category II

Anticoagulants

Recommendation

Do not routinely use anticoagulant therapy to reduce the risk of catheter-related infection in general patient populations [234]. Category II

Replacement of Peripheral and Midline Catheters

Recommendations

1. Replace peripheral catheters every 72-96 hours to reduce risk of infection and phlebitis in adults. Category 1B

2. Replace peripheral catheters in children only when clinically indicated [82, 83].
Category 1B

2. Replace midline catheters only when there is a specific indication. Category II

Replacement of CVCs, Including PICCs and Hemodialysis Catheters

Recommendations

1. Do not routinely replace CVCs, PICCs, hemodialysis catheters, or pulmonary artery catheters to prevent catheter-related infections. Category IB

2. Do not remove CVCs or PICCs on the basis of fever alone. Use clinical judgment regarding the appropriateness of removing the catheter if infection is evidenced elsewhere or if a noninfectious cause of fever is suspected. Category II

3. Do not use guidewire exchanges routinely for non-tunneled catheters to prevent infection. Category IB

4. Do not use guidewire exchanges to replace a non-tunneled catheter suspected of infection. Category IB

4. Use a guidewire exchange to replace a malfunctioning non-tunneled catheter if no evidence of infection is present. Category IB

5. Use new sterile gloves before handling the new catheter when guidewire exchanges are performed. Category II

Umbilical Catheters

Recommendations

1. Remove and do not replace umbilical artery catheters if any signs of CRBSI, vascular insufficiency, or thrombosis are present [278]. Category II

2. Remove and do not replace umbilical venous catheters if any signs of CRBSI or thrombosis are present [278]. Category II

3. No recommendation can be made for treating through an umbilical venous catheter suspected of being infected. Unresolved issue

4. Replace umbilical venous catheters only if the catheter malfunctions. Category II

5. Cleanse the umbilical insertion site with an antiseptic before catheter insertion. Avoid tincture of iodine because of the potential effect on the neonatal thyroid. Other iodine-containing products (e.g., povidone iodine) can be used [279-283]. Category IB

6. Do not use topical antibiotic ointment or creams on umbilical catheter insertion sites because of the potential to promote fungal infections and antimicrobial resistance [150, 151]. Category IA

7. Add low doses of heparin (0.25-1.0 U/ml) to the fluid infused through umbilical arterial catheters [284-286]. Category IB

8. Remove umbilical catheters as soon as possible when no longer needed or when any sign of vascular insufficiency to the lower extremities is observed. Optimally, umbilical artery catheters should not be left in place >5 days [278, 287]. Category II

9. Umbilical venous catheters should be removed as soon as possible when no longer needed, but can be used up to 14 days if managed aseptically [288, 289]. Category II

Peripheral Arterial Catheters and Pressure Monitoring Devices for Adult and Pediatric Patients

Recommendations

1. In adults, use of the radial, brachial or dorsalis pedis sites is preferred over the femoral or axillary sites of insertion to reduce the risk of infection [94, 95, 292, 293]. Category IB

2. In children, do not use the brachial site. The radial, dorsalis pedis, and posterior tibial sites are preferred over the femoral or axillary sites of insertion [94]. Category II

3. Use a cap, mask, sterile gloves and a large sterile fenestrated drape during peripheral arterial catheter insertion [95, 293]. Category IB

4. Use maximal sterile barriers precautions during axillary or femoral artery catheter insertion. Category II

5. Replace arterial catheters only when there is a clinical indication. Category II

6. Remove the arterial catheter as soon as it is no longer needed. Category II

7. Use disposable, rather than reusable, transducer assemblies when possible [294-298]. Category IB

8. Do not routinely replace arterial catheters to prevent catheter-related infections [262, 276, 299, 300]. Category II

9. Replace disposable or reusable transducers at 96-hour intervals. Replace other components of the system (including the tubing, continuous-flush device, and flush solution) at the time the transducer is replaced [25, 295]. Category IB

10. Keep all components of the pressure monitoring system (including calibration devices and flush solution) sterile [294, 301-303]. Category IA

11. Minimize the number of manipulations of and entries into the pressure monitoring system. Use a closed flush system (i.e., continuous flush), rather than an open system (i.e., one that requires a syringe and stopcock), to maintain the patency of the pressure monitoring catheters [297, 304]. Category II

Deleted: should not be used

Deleted: A

Deleted: should be used

Deleted: .

Deleted: D

Deleted: , maximal sterile barriers¶ precautions should be used.

12. When the pressure monitoring system is accessed through a diaphragm, rather than a stopcock, wipe the diaphragm with an appropriate antiseptic before accessing the system [297]. Category IA

13. Do not administer dextrose-containing solutions or parenteral nutrition fluids through the pressure monitoring circuit [297, 305, 306]. Category IA

14. Sterilize reusable transducers according to the manufacturers' instructions if the use of disposable transducers is not feasible [297, 305-308]. Category IA

Replacement of Administration Sets

Recommendations

1. In patients not receiving blood, blood products or lipid emulsions, replace administration sets, including secondary sets and add-on devices, no more frequently than at 96-hour intervals, [313] but at least every 7 days [255, 314-316]. Category IA

2. Replace tubing used to administer blood, blood products, or lipid emulsions (those combined with amino acids and glucose in a 3-in-1 admixture or infused separately) within 24 hours of initiating the infusion [317-320]. Category IB

3. Replace tubing used to administer propofol infusions every 6 or 12 hours, when the vial is changed, per the manufacturer's recommendation (FDA website Medwatch) [321]. Category IA

Needleless Intravascular Catheter Systems

Recommendations

1. Change the needleless components at least as frequently as the administration set. There is no benefit to changing these more frequently than every 72 hours [87, 328-334]. Category II

2. Change caps no more frequently than every 72 hours for the purpose of reduced infection rates or according to manufacturers' recommendations[328, 330, 333, 334]. Category II

3. Ensure that all components of the system are compatible to minimize leaks and breaks in the system[335]. Category II

4. Minimize contamination risk by wiping the access port with an appropriate antiseptic (chlorhexidine preferred) and accessing the port only with sterile devices [330, 333, 335]. Category IA

5. Use a needleless system to access IV tubing. Category IC

6. When needleless systems are used, the split septum valve is preferred over the mechanical valve due to increased risk of infection [336-339]. Category II

Multidose Parenteral Medication Vials and Parenteral Fluids

Recommendations

1. Mix all routine parenteral fluids in the pharmacy in a laminar flow hood using aseptic technique [347, 348]. Category IB

2. Do not use any container of parenteral fluid that has visible turbidity, leaks, cracks, particulate matter, or if the manufacturer's expiration date has passed [348]. Category IB

3. Use single dose vials for parenteral additives or medications when possible [348, 349]. Category II

4. Do not combine the leftover content of single use vials for later use [348, 349]. Category IA

5. If multidose vials are used, refrigerate multidose vials after they are opened if recommended by the manufacturer [348]. Category II

6. Cleanse the access diaphragm of multidose vials with 70% alcohol before inserting a device into the vial [350]. Category IA

7. Use a sterile device to access a multidose vial and avoid touch contamination of the device before penetrating the access diaphragm [351, 352]. Category IA

8. Discard multidose vial if sterility is compromised [351, 352]. Category IA

9. All multidose vials should be dated when 1st used and thereafter not used beyond the manufacturer's stated expiration period. Category IC

10. Use the needle and syringe to access the multidose vial only once and to then discard both safely. This applies to each and every dose withdrawn from the vial [351, 352]. Category IA

11. Complete the infusion of lipid-containing solutions (e.g., 3-in-1 solutions) within 24 hours of hanging the solution [317, 318, 326, 327, 353]Category IB

12. Complete the infusion of lipid emulsions alone within 12 hours of hanging the emulsion. If volume considerations require more time, the infusion should be completed within 24 hours [317, 326, 327]. Category IB

13. Complete infusions of blood or other blood products within 4 hours of hanging the blood[354-357]. Category II

14. No recommendation can be made for the hang time of other parenteral fluids.

Unresolved issue

Performance Improvement

Recommendation

Use hospital-specific or collaborative-based performance improvement initiatives in which multifaceted strategies are "bundled" together improve compliance with evidence-based recommended practices [61, 108, 109, 362-366]. Category 1B

1649

1650

1651

1652
1653

1654

1655

1656

1657

1658

1659

1660

1661
1662
1663

1664
1665

1666

1667 References

1668

1669 1. Mermel LA. Prevention of intravascular catheter-related infections (Erratum: Ann
1670 Intern Med 133:395, 2000). Ann Intern Med 2000;132:391-402

1671 2. Dimick JB, Pelz RK, Consunji R, Swoboda SM, Hendrix CW and Lipsett PA.
1672 Increased resource use associated with catheter-related bloodstream infection in the
1673 surgical intensive care unit. Arch Surg 2001;136:229-34.

1674 3. Warren DK, Quadir WW, Hollenbeak CS, Elward AM, Cox MJ and Fraser VJ.
1675 Attributable cost of catheter-associated bloodstream infections among intensive care
1676 patients in a nonteaching hospital. Crit Care Med 2006;34:2084-9

1677 4. Blot SI, Depuydt P, Annemans L, et al. Clinical and economic outcomes in critically ill
1678 patients with nosocomial catheter-related bloodstream infections. Clin Infect Dis
1679 2005;41:1591-8

1680 5. Renaud B, Brun-Buisson C. Outcomes of primary and catheter-related bacteremia. A
1681 cohort and case-control study in critically ill patients. Am J Respir Crit Care Med
1682 2001;163:1584-90

1683 6. Maki DG, Kluger DM and Crnich CJ. The risk of bloodstream infection in adults with
1684 different intravascular devices: a systematic review of 200 published prospective studies.
1685 Mayo Clin Proc 2006;81:1159-71

1686 7. Bellini C, Petignat C, Francioli P, et al. Comparison of automated strategies for
1687 surveillance of nosocomial bacteremia. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2007;28:1030-5

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: French (France)

8. Borlawsky T, Hota B, Lin MY, et al. Development of a reference information model and knowledgebase for electronic bloodstream infection detection. AMIA Annu Symp Proc 2008:56-60

9. Rubin MA, Mayer J, Greene T, et al. An agent-based model for evaluating surveillance methods for catheter-related bloodstream infection. AMIA Annu Symp Proc 2008:631-5

10. Trick WE, Zagorski BM, Tokars JI, et al. Computer algorithms to detect bloodstream infections. Emerg Infect Dis 2004;10:1612-20

11. Horan TC, Andrus M and Dudeck MA. CDC/NHSN surveillance definition of health care-associated infection and criteria for specific types of infections in the acute care setting. Am J Infect Control 2008;36:309-32

12. Mermel LA, Allon M, Bouza E, et al. Clinical practice guidelines for the diagnosis and management of intravascular catheter-related infection: 2009 Update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Clin Infect Dis 2009;49:1-45

13. Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations. Accreditation manual for hospitals. In: Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, ed. Chicago, IL, 1994:121-140

14. National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance (NNIS) System Report, data summary from January 1992 through June 2004, issued October 2004. Am J Infect Control 2004;32:470-85

15. Edwards JR, Peterson KD, Andrus ML, Dudeck MA, Pollock DA and Horan TC. National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) Report, data summary for 2006 through 2007, issued November 2008. Am J Infect Control 2008;36:609-26

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: French (France)

16. Wisplinghoff H, Bischoff T, Tallent SM, Seifert H, Wenzel RP and Edmond MB. Nosocomial bloodstream infections in US hospitals: analysis of 24,179 cases from a prospective nationwide surveillance study. Clin Infect Dis 2004;39:309-17

17. Gaynes R, Edwards JR. Overview of nosocomial infections caused by gram-negative bacilli. Clin Infect Dis 2005;41:848-54

18. Burton DC, Edwards JR, Horan TC, Jernigan JA and Fridkin SK. Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus central line-associated bloodstream infections in US intensive care units, 1997-2007. JAMA 2009;301:727-36

19. National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance (NNIS) system report, data summary from January 1992-April 2000, issued June 2000. Am J Infect Control 2000;28:429-48

20. Richards MJ, Edwards JR, Culver DH and Gaynes RP. Nosocomial infections in medical intensive care units in the United States. National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance System. Crit Care Med 1999;27:887-92

21. Richards MJ, Edwards JR, Culver DH and Gaynes RP. Nosocomial infections in pediatric intensive care units in the United States. National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance System. Pediatrics 1999;103:103-9

22. Garland JS, Alex CP, Mueller CD, et al. A randomized trial comparing povidone-iodine to a chlorhexidine gluconate-impregnated dressing for prevention of central venous catheter infections in neonates. Pediatrics 2001;107:1431-6.

23. Garland JS, Alex CP, Henrickson KJ, McAuliffe TL and Maki DG. A vancomycin-heparin lock solution for prevention of nosocomial bloodstream infection in critically ill neonates with peripherally inserted central venous catheters: a prospective, randomized trial. Pediatrics 2005;116:e198-205

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: Portuguese (Brazil)

24. Safdar N, Maki DG. The pathogenesis of catheter-related bloodstream infection with noncuffed short-term central venous catheters. Intensive Care Med 2004;30:62-7

25. Mermel LA, McCormick RD, Springman SR and Maki DG. The pathogenesis and epidemiology of catheter-related infection with pulmonary artery Swan-Ganz catheters: a prospective study utilizing molecular subtyping. Am J Med 1991;91:197S-205S

26. Maki DG, Weise CE and Sarafin HW. A semiquantitative culture method for identifying intravenous-catheter-related infection. N Engl J Med 1977;296:1305-9

27. Raad I, Costerton W, Sabharwal U, Sacilowski M, Anaissie E and Bodey GP. Ultrastructural analysis of indwelling vascular catheters: a quantitative relationship between luminal colonization and duration of placement. J Infect Dis 1993;168:400-7

28. Dobbins BM, Kite P, Kindon A, McMahon MJ and Wilcox MH. DNA fingerprinting analysis of coagulase negative staphylococci implicated in catheter-related bloodstream infections. J Clin Pathol 2002;55:824-8

29. Anaissie E, Samonis G, Kontoyiannis D, et al. Role of catheter colonization and infrequent hematogenous seeding in catheter-related infections. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis 1995;14:134-7

30. Raad I, Hanna HA, Awad A, et al. Optimal frequency of changing intravenous administration sets: is it safe to prolong use beyond 72 hours? Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2001;22:136-9.

31. Mehall JR, Saltzman DA, Jackson RJ and Smith SD. Fibrin sheath enhances central venous catheter infection. Crit Care Med 2002;30:908-12

32. Donlan RM, Costerton JW. Biofilms: survival mechanisms of clinically relevant microorganisms. Clin Microbiol Rev 2002;15:167-93

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: Italian (Italy)

1756 33. Hawser SP, Douglas LJ. Biofilm formation by Candida species on the surface of
1757 catheter materials in vitro. Infect Immun 1994;62:915-21

1758 34. Stillman RM, Soliman F, Garcia L and Sawyer PN. Etiology of catheter-associated
1759 sepsis. Correlation with thrombogenicity. Arch Surg 1977;112:1497-9

1760 35. Raad, II, Luna M, Khalil SA, Costerton JW, Lam C and Bodey GP. The relationship
1761 between the thrombotic and infectious complications of central venous catheters. JAMA
1762 1994;271:1014-6

1763 36. Herrmann M, Suchard SJ, Boxer LA, Waldvogel FA and Lew PD. Thrombospondin
1764 binds to Staphylococcus aureus and promotes staphylococcal adherence to surfaces.
1765 Infect Immun 1991;59:279-88

1766 37. Shanks RM, Sargent JL, Martinez RM, Graber ML and O'Toole GA. Catheter lock
1767 solutions influence staphylococcal biofilm formation on abiotic surfaces. Nephrol Dial
1768 Transplant 2006;21:2247-55

1769 38. Chatzinikolaou I, Zipf TF, Hanna H, et al. Minocycline-ethylenediaminetetraacetate
1770 lock solution for the prevention of implantable port infections in children with cancer.
1771 Clin Infect Dis 2003;36:116-9

1772 39. McDevitt D, Francois P, Vaudaux P and Foster TJ. Identification of the ligand-
1773 binding domain of the surface-located fibrinogen receptor (clumping factor) of
1774 Staphylococcus aureus. Mol Microbiol 1995;16:895-907

1775 40. Ni Eidhin D, Perkins S, Francois P, Vaudaux P, Hook M and Foster TJ. Clumping
1776 factor B (ClfB), a new surface-located fibrinogen-binding adhesin of Staphylococcus
1777 aureus. Mol Microbiol 1998;30:245-57

1778 41. Mack D, Davies AP, Harris LG, Rohde H, Horstkotte MA and Knobloch JK.
1779 Microbial interactions in Staphylococcus epidermidis biofilms. Anal Bioanal Chem
1780 2007;387:399-408
1781 42. von Eiff C, Peters G and Heilmann C. Pathogenesis of infections due to coagulase-
1782 negative staphylococci. Lancet Infect Dis 2002;2:677-85
1783 43. Zhu Y, Weiss EC, Otto M, Fey PD, Smeltzer MS and Somerville GA.
1784 Staphylococcus aureus metabolism in a biofilm: the influence of arginine on
1785 polysaccharide intercellular adhesin synthesis, biofilm formation, and pathogenesis.
1786 Infect Immun 2007
1787 44. Murga R, Miller JM and Donlan RM. Biofilm formation by gram-negative bacteria
1788 on central venous catheter connectors: effect of conditioning films in a laboratory model.
1789 J Clin Microbiol 2001;39:2294-7
1790 45. Douglas LJ. Candida biofilms and their role in infection. Trends Microbiol
1791 2003;11:30-6
1792 46. Donlan RM. Biofilms: microbial life on surfaces. Emerg Infect Dis 2002;8:881-90
1793 47. Dunne WM, Jr., Burd EM. The effects of magnesium, calcium, EDTA, and pH on the
1794 in vitro adhesion of Staphylococcus epidermidis to plastic. Microbiol Immunol
1795 1992;36:1019-27
1796 48. Ozerdem Akpolat N, Elci S, Atmaca S, Akbayin H and Gul K. The effects of
1797 magnesium, calcium and EDTA on slime production by Staphylococcus epidermidis
1798 strains. Folia Microbiol (Praha) 2003;48:649-53
1799 49. Banin E, Brady KM and Greenberg EP. Chelator-induced dispersal and killing of
1800 Pseudomonas aeruginosa cells in a biofilm. Appl Environ Microbiol 2006;72:2064-9

Formatted: French (France)

50. Donlan RM. Role of biofilms in antimicrobial resistance. Asaio J 2000;46:S47-52

51. Farber BF, Kaplan MH and Clogston AG. Staphylococcus epidermidis extracted slime inhibits the antimicrobial action of glycopeptide antibiotics. J Infect Dis 1990;161:37-40

52. Branchini ML, Pfaller MA, Rhine-Chalberg J, Frempong T and Isenberg HD. Genotypic variation and slime production among blood and catheter isolates of Candida parapsilosis. J Clin Microbiol 1994;32:452-6

53. Yoo S, Ha M, Choi D and Pai H. Effectiveness of surveillance of central catheter-related bloodstream infection in an ICU in Korea. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2001;22:433-6

54. Warren DK, Zack JE, Cox MJ, Cohen MM and Fraser VJ. An educational intervention to prevent catheter-associated bloodstream infections in a non-teeaching community medical center. Crit Care Med 2003;31

55. Warren DK, Zack JE, Mayfield JL, et al. The effect of an education program on the incidence of central venous catheter-associated bloodstream infection in a medical ICU. Chest 2004;126:1612-8

56. Warren DK, Cosgrove SE, Diekema DJ, et al. A multicenter intervention to prevent catheter-associated bloodstream infections. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2006;27:662-9

57. Higuera F, Rosenthal VD, Duarte P, Ruiz J, Franco G and Safdar N. The effect of process control on the incidence of central venous catheter-associated bloodstream infections and mortality in intensive care units in Mexico. Crit Care Med 2005;33:2022-7

Formatted: German (Germany)

Formatted: Italian (Italy)

1823 58. Coopersmith CM, Rebmann TL, Zack JE, et al. Effect of an education program on
1824 decreasing catheter-related bloodstream infections in the surgical intensive care unit. Crit
1825 Care Med 2002;30:59-64

1826 59. Coopersmith CM, Zack JE, Ward MR, et al. The impact of bedside behavior on
1827 catheter-related bacteremia in the intensive care unit. Arch Surg 2004;139:131-6

1828 60. Sherertz RJ, Ely EW, Westbrook DM, et al. Education of physicians-in-training can
1829 decrease the risk for vascular catheter infection. Ann Intern Med 2000;132:641-8

1830 61. Eggimann P, Harbarth S, Constantin MN, Touveneau S, Chevrolet JC and Pittet D.
1831 Impact of a prevention strategy targeted at vascular-access care on incidence of infections
1832 acquired in intensive care. Lancet 2000;355:1864-8
1833 62. Nehme AE. Nutritional support of the hospitalized patient. The team concept. JAMA
1834 1980;243:1906-8

1835 63. Soifer NE, Borzak S, Edlin BR and Weinstein RA. Prevention of peripheral venous
1836 catheter complications with an intravenous therapy team: a randomized controlled trial.
1837 Arch Intern Med 1998;158:473-7

1838 64. Tomford JW, Hershey CO, McLaren CE, Porter DK and Cohen DI. Intravenous
1839 therapy team and peripheral venous catheter-associated complications. A prospective
1840 controlled study. Arch Intern Med 1984;144:1191-4

1841 65. Scalley RD, Van CS and Cochran RS. The impact of an i.v. team on the occurrence of
1842 intravenous-related phlebitis. A 30-month study. J Intraven Nurs 1992;15:100-9
1843 66. Palefski SS, Stoddard GJ. The infusion nurse and patient complication rates of
1844 peripheral-short catheters. A prospective evaluation. J Intraven Nurs 2001;24:113-23

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

1845 67. Miller JM, Goetz AM, Squier C and Muder RR. Reduction in nosocomial intravenous
1846 device-related bacteremias after institution of an intravenous therapy team. J Intraven
1847 Nurs 1996;19:103-6
1848 68. Hunter MR. Development of a Vascular Access Team in an acute care setting. J Infus
1849 Nurs 2003;26:86-91

1850 69. Hawes ML. A proactive approach to combating venous depletion in the hospital
1851 setting. J Infus Nurs 2007;30:33-44

1852 70. Brunelle D. Impact of a dedicated infusion therapy team on the reduction of catheter-
1853 related nosocomial infections. J Infus Nurs 2003;26:362-6

1854 71. Bosma TL, Jewesson PJ. An infusion program resource nurse consult service: our
1855 experience in a major Canadian teaching hospital. J Infus Nurs 2002;25:310-5

1856 72. Pierce CA, Baker JJ. A nursing process model: quantifying infusion therapy resource
1857 consumption. J Infus Nurs 2004;27:232-44

1858 73. Tomford JW, Hershey CO. The i.v. therapy team: impact on patient care and costs of
1859 hospitalization. NITA 1985;8:387-9

1860 74. Davis D, O'Brien MA, Freemantle N, Wolf FM, Mazmanian P and Taylor-Vaisey A.
1861 Impact of formal continuing medical education: do conferences, workshops, rounds, and
1862 other traditional continuing education activities change physician behavior or health care
1863 outcomes? JAMA 1999;282:867-74
1864 75. Alonso-Echanove J, Edwards JR, Richards MJ, et al. Effect of nurse staffing and
1865 antimicrobial-impregnated central venous catheters on the risk for bloodstream infections
1866 in intensive care units. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2003;24:916-25

1867 76. Fridkin SK, Pear SM, Williamson TH, Galgiani JN and Jarvis WR. The role of
1868 understaffing in central venous catheter-associated bloodstream infections. Infect Control
1869 Hosp Epidemiol 1996;17:150-8
1870 77. Robert J, Fridkin SK, Blumberg HM, et al. The influence of the composition of the
1871 nursing staff on primary bloodstream infection rates in a surgical intensive care unit.
1872 Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2000;21:12-7.
1873 78. Sanders RA, Sheldon GF. Septic complications of total parenteral nutrition. A five
1874 year experience. Am J Surg 1976;132:214-20
1875 79. Ryan JA, Jr., Abel RM, Abbott WM, et al. Catheter complications in total parenteral
1876 nutrition. A prospective study of 200 consecutive patients. N Engl J Med 1974;290:757-
1877 61
1878 80. Murphy LM, Lipman TO. Central venous catheter care in parenteral nutrition: a
1879 review. JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr 1987;11:190-201
1880 81. Armstrong CW, Mayhall CG, Miller KB, et al. Prospective study of catheter
1881 replacement and other risk factors for infection of hyperalimentation catheters. J Infect
1882 Dis 1986;154:808-16
1883 82. Maki DG, Goldman DA and Rhame FS. Infection control in intravenous therapy. Ann
1884 Intern Med 1973;79:867-87
1885 83. Band JD, Maki DG. Steel needles used for intravenous therapy. Morbidity in patients
1886 with hematologic malignancy. Arch Intern Med 1980;140:31-4
1887 84. Tully JL, Friedland GH, Baldini LM and Goldmann DA. Complications of
1888 intravenous therapy with steel needles and Teflon catheters. A comparative study. Am J
1889 Med 1981;70:702-6

1890 85. Ryder MA. Peripheral access options. Surg Oncol Clin N Am 1995;4:395-427
1891 86. Parienti JJ, Thirion M, Megarbane B, et al. Femoral vs jugular venous catheterization
1892 and risk of nosocomial events in adults requiring acute renal replacement therapy: a
1893 randomized controlled trial. JAMA 2008;299:2413-22
1894 87. Moretti EW, Ofstead CL, Kristy RM and Wetzler HP. Impact of central venous
1895 catheter type and methods on catheter-related colonization and bacteraemia. J Hosp Infect
1896 2005;61:139-45
1897 88. Nagashima G, Kikuchi T, Tsuyuzaki H, et al. To reduce catheter-related bloodstream
1898 infections: is the subclavian route better than the jugular route for central venous
1899 catheterization? J Infect Chemother 2006;12:363-5
1900 89. Ruesch S, Walder B and Tramer MR. Complications of central venous catheters:
1901 internal jugular versus subclavian access--a systematic review. Crit Care Med
1902 2002;30:454-60
1903 90. Sadoyama G, Gontijo Filho PP. Comparison between the jugular and subclavian vein
1904 as insertion site for central venous catheters: microbiological aspects and risk factors for
1905 colonization and infection. Braz J Infect Dis 2003;7:142-8
1906 91. Heard SO, Wagle M, Vijayakumar E, et al. Influence of triple-lumen central venous
1907 catheters coated with chlorhexidine and silver sulfadiazine on the incidence of catheter-
1908 related bacteremia. Arch Intern Med 1998;158:81-7
1909 92. Richet H, Hubert B, Nitemberg G, et al. Prospective multicenter study of vascular-
1910 catheter-related complications and risk factors for positive central-catheter cultures in
1911 intensive care unit patients. J Clin Microbiol 1990;28:2520-5

Formatted: French (France)

1912 93. Safdar N, Kluger DM and Maki DG. A review of risk factors for catheter-related
1913 bloodstream infection caused by percutaneously inserted, noncuffed central venous
1914 catheters: implications for preventive strategies. Medicine (Baltimore) 2002;81:466-79
1915 94. Lorente L, Jimenez A, Iribarren JL, Jimenez JJ, Martin MM and Mora ML. The
1916 micro-organism responsible for central venous catheter-related bloodstream infection
1917 depends on catheter site. Intensive Care Med 2006;32:1449-50
1918 95. Traore O, Liotier J and Souweine B. Prospective study of arterial and central venous
1919 catheter colonization and of arterial- and central venous catheter-related bacteremia in
1920 intensive care units. Crit Care Med 2005;33:1276-80
1921 96. Joynt GM, Kew J, Gomersall CD, Leung VY and Liu EK. Deep venous thrombosis
1922 caused by femoral venous catheters in critically ill adult patients. Chest 2000;117:178-83.
1923 97. Mian NZ, Bayly R, Schreck DM, Besserman EB and Richmand D. Incidence of deep
1924 venous thrombosis associated with femoral venous catheterization. Acad Emerg Med
1925 1997;4:1118-21.
1926 98. Merrer J, De Jonghe B, Golliot F, et al. Complications of femoral and subclavian
1927 venous catheterization in critically ill patients: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA
1928 2001;286:700-7.
1929 99. Goetz AM, Wagener MM, Miller JM and Muder RR. Risk of infection due to central
1930 venous catheters: effect of site of placement and catheter type. Infect Control Hosp
1931 Epidemiol 1998;19:842-5
1932 100. Robinson JF, Robinson WA, Cohn A, Garg K and Armstrong JD, 2nd. Perforation
1933 of the great vessels during central venous line placement. Arch Intern Med
1934 1995;155:1225-8

Formatted: Italian (Italy)

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

101. Trottier SJ, Veremakis C, O'Brien J and Auer AI. Femoral deep vein thrombosis associated with central venous catheterization: results from a prospective, randomized trial. Crit Care Med 1995;23:52-9

102. Schillinger F, Schillinger D, Montagnac R and Milcent T. Post catheterisation vein stenosis in haemodialysis: comparative angiographic study of 50 subclavian and 50 internal jugular accesses. Nephrol Dial Transplant 1991;6:722-4

103. Cimochowski GE, Worley E, Rutherford WE, Sartain J, Blondin J and Harter H. Superiority of the internal jugular over the subclavian access for temporary dialysis. Nephron 1990;54:154-61

104. Barrett N, Spencer S, McIvor J and Brown EA. Subclavian stenosis: a major complication of subclavian dialysis catheters. Nephrol Dial Transplant 1988;3:423-5

105. Trerotola SO, Kuhn-Fulton J, Johnson MS, Shah H, Ambrosius WT and Kneebone PH. Tunneled infusion catheters: increased incidence of symptomatic venous thrombosis after subclavian versus internal jugular venous access. Radiology 2000;217:89-93

106. Hind D, Calvert N, McWilliams R, et al. Ultrasonic locating devices for central venous cannulation: meta-analysis. Bmj 2003;327:361

107. Randolph AG, Cook DJ, Gonzales CA and Pribble CG. Ultrasound guidance for placement of central venous catheters: a meta-analysis of the literature. Crit Care Med 1996;24:2053-8.

108. Pronovost P, Needham D, Berenholtz S, et al. An intervention to decrease catheter-related bloodstream infections in the ICU. N Engl J Med 2006;355:2725-32

109. Berenholtz SM, Pronovost PJ, Lipsett PA, et al. Eliminating catheter-related bloodstream infections in the intensive care unit. Crit Care Med 2004;32:2014-20

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

1958 110. Bansmer G, Keith D and Tesluk H. Complications following use of indwelling
1959 catheters of inferior vena cava. JAMA 1958;167:1606-11
1960 111. Crane C. Venous interruption of septic thrombophlebitis. N Engl J Med
1961 1960;262:947-51
1962 112. Indar R. The dangers of indwelling polyethelene cannulae in deep veins. Lancet
1963 1959;1:284-6
1964 113. Maki DG, Mermel LA. Infections due to infusion therapy. In: JV B, PS B, eds.
1965 Hospital Infections. 4 ed. Philadelphia: Lippencott-Raven, 1998:689-724
1966 114. Garland JS, Dunne WM, Jr., Havens P, et al. Peripheral intravenous catheter
1967 complications in critically ill children: a prospective study. Pediatrics 1992;89:1145-50
1968 115. Garland JS, Nelson DB, Cheah TE, Hennes HH and Johnson TM. Infectious
1969 complications during peripheral intravenous therapy with Teflon catheters: a prospective
1970 study. Pediatr Infect Dis J 1987;6:918-21
1971 116. Breschan C, Platzer M, Jost R, Schaumberger F, Stettner H and Likar R.
1972 Comparison of catheter-related infection and tip colonization between internal jugular
1973 and subclavian central venous catheters in surgical neonates. Anesthesiology
1974 2007;107:946-53
1975 117. Deshpande KS, Hatem C, Ulrich HL, et al. The incidence of infectious
1976 complications of central venous catheters at the subclavian, internal jugular, and femoral
1977 sites in an intensive care unit population. Crit Care Med 2005;33:13-20; discussion 234-5
1978 118. Durbec O, Viviand X, Potie F, Vialet R, Albanese J and Martin C. A prospective
1979 evaluation of the use of femoral venous catheters in critically ill adults. Crit Care Med
1980 1997;25:1986-9.

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

Formatted: German (Germany)

119. Venkataraman ST, Thompson AE and Orr RA. Femoral vascular catheterization in critically ill infants and children. Clin Pediatr (Phila) 1997;36:311-9.

120. Sheridan RL, Weber JM. Mechanical and infectious complications of central venous cannulation in children: lessons learned from a 10-year experience placing more than 1000 catheters. J Burn Care Res 2006;27:713-8

121. Stenzel JP, Green TP, Fuhrman BP, Carlson PE and Marchessault RP. Percutaneous central venous catheterization in a pediatric intensive care unit: a survival analysis of complications. Crit Care Med 1989;17:984-8

122. Goldstein AM, Weber JM and Sheridan RL. Femoral venous access is safe in burned children: an analysis of 224 catheters. J Pediatr 1997;130:442-6.

123. Ramos GE, Bolgiani AN, Patino O, et al. Catheter infection risk related to the distance between insertion site and burned area. J Burn Care Rehabil 2002;23:266-71

124. Sheth NK, Franson TR, Rose HD, Buckmire FL, Cooper JA and Sohnle PG. Colonization of bacteria on polyvinyl chloride and Teflon intravascular catheters in hospitalized patients. J Clin Microbiol 1983;18:1061-3

125. Maki DG, Ringer M. Risk factors for infusion-related phlebitis with small peripheral venous catheters. A randomized controlled trial. Ann Intern Med 1991;114:845-54

126. Maki DG, Ringer M. Evaluation of dressing regimens for prevention of infection with peripheral intravenous catheters. Gauze, a transparent polyurethane dressing, and an iodophor-transparent dressing. JAMA 1987;258:2396-403

127. Boyce JM, Pittet D. Guideline for Hand Hygiene in Health-Care Settings: recommendations of the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee and

Formatted: Portuguese (Brazil)

2003 the HICPAC/SHEA/APIC/IDSA Hand Hygiene Task Force. Infect Control Hosp
2004 Epidemiol 2002;23:S3-40

2005 128. Bischoff WE, Reynolds TM, Sessler CN, Edmond MB and Wenzel RP.
2006 Handwashing compliance by healthcare workers: The impact of introducing an

2007 accessible, alcohol-based hand antiseptic. Arch Intern Med 2000;160:1017-21
2008 129. Boyce JM, Kelliher S and Vallande N. Skin irritation and dryness associated with
2009 two hand-hygiene regimens: soap-and-water hand washing versus hand antisepsis with an
2010 alcoholic hand gel. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2000;21:442-8.
2011 130. Pittet D, Dharan S, Touveneau S, Sauvan V and Perneger TV. Bacterial
2012 contamination of the hands of hospital staff during routine patient care. Arch Intern Med
2013 1999;159:821-6

2014 131. Simmons B, Bryant J, Neiman K, Spencer L and Arheart K. The role of
2015 handwashing in prevention of endemic intensive care unit infections. Infect Control Hosp
2016 Epidemiol 1990;11:589-94
2017 132. Raad, II, Hohn DC, Gilbreath BJ, et al. Prevention of central venous catheter-related
2018 infections by using maximal sterile barrier precautions during insertion. Infect Control
2019 Hosp Epidemiol 1994;15:231-8
2020 133. Capdevila JA, Segarra A and Pahissa A. Catheter-related bacteremia in patients
2021 undergoing hemodialysis. Ann Intern Med 1998;128:600
2022 134. Abi-Said D, Raad I, Umphrey J, et al. Infusion therapy team and dressing changes of
2023 central venous catheters. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 1999;20:101-5
2024 135. Pittet D, Hugonnet S, Harbath S, et al. Effectiveness of a hospital-wide prgramme to
2025 improve compliance with hand hygiene. Lancet 2000;356:1307-9

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

Formatted: French (France)

136. Carrer S, Bocchi A, Bortolotti M, et al. Effect of different sterile barrier precautions and central venous catheter dressing on the skin colonization around the insertion site. Minerva Anestesiol 2005;71:197-206

137. Mermel LA, Maki DG. Infectious complications of Swan-Ganz pulmonary artery catheters. Pathogenesis, epidemiology, prevention, and management. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1994;149:1020-36

138. Cohen Y, Fosse JP, Karoubi P, et al. The "hands-off" catheter and the prevention of systemic infections associated with pulmonary artery catheter: a prospective study. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1998;157:284-7

139. Maki DG, Band JD. A comparative study of polyantibiotic and iodophor ointments in prevention of vascular catheter-related infection. Am J Med 1981;70:739-44

140. Maki DG, Ringer M and Alvarado CJ. Prospective randomised trial of povidone-iodine, alcohol, and chlorhexidine for prevention of infection associated with central venous and arterial catheters. Lancet 1991;338:339-43

141. Mimoz O, Pieroni L, Lawrence C, et al. Prospective, randomized trial of two antiseptic solutions for prevention of central venous or arterial catheter colonization and infection in intensive care unit patients. Crit Care Med 1996;24:1818-23

142. Humar A, Ostromecki A, Direnfeld J, et al. Prospective randomized trial of 10% povidone-iodine versus 0.5% tincture of chlorhexidine as cutaneous antisepsis for prevention of central venous catheter infection. Clin Infect Dis 2000;31:1001-7

143. Chaiyakunapruk N, Veenstra DL, Lipsky BA and Saint S. Chlorhexidine compared with povidone-iodine solution for vascular catheter-site care: a meta-analysis. Ann Intern Med 2002;136:792-801

Formatted: Italian (Italy)

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

Formatted: French (France)

144. Chaiyakunapruk N, Veenstra DL, Lipsky BA, Sullivan SD and Saint S. Vascular catheter site care: the clinical and economic benefits of chlorhexidine gluconate compared with povidone iodine. Clin Infect Dis 2003;37:764-71

145. Parienti JJ, du Cheyron D, Ramakers M, et al. Alcoholic povidone-iodine to prevent central venous catheter colonization: A randomized unit-crossover study. Crit Care Med 2004;32:708-13

146. Maki DG, Stolz SS, Wheeler S and Mermel LA. A prospective, randomized trial of gauze and two polyurethane dressings for site care of pulmonary artery catheters: implications for catheter management. Crit Care Med 1994;22:1729-37

147. Bijma R, Girbes AR, Kleijer DJ and Zwaveling JH. Preventing central venous catheter-related infection in a surgical intensive-care unit. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 1999;20:618-20

148. Madeo M, Martin CR, Turner C, Kirkby V and Thompson DR. A randomized trial comparing Arglaes (a transparent dressing containing silver ions) to Tegaderm (a transparent polyurethane dressing) for dressing peripheral arterial catheters and central vascular catheters. Intensive Crit Care Nurs 1998;14:187-91

149. Laura R, Degl'Innocenti M, Mocali M, et al. Comparison of two different time interval protocols for central venous catheter dressing in bone marrow transplant patients: results of a randomized, multicenter study. The Italian Nurse Bone Marrow Transplant Group (GITMO). Haematologica 2000;85:275-9

150. Zakrzewska-Bode A, Muytjens HL, Liem KD and Hoogkamp-Korstanje JA. Mupirocin resistance in coagulase-negative staphylococci, after topical prophylaxis for the reduction of colonization of central venous catheters. J Hosp Infect 1995;31:189-93

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: French (France)

2072 151. Flowers RH, Schwenzer KJ, Kopel RF, Fisch MJ, Tucker SI and Farr BM. Efficacy
2073 of an attachable subcutaneous cuff for the prevention of intravascular catheter-related
2074 infection. A randomized, controlled trial. JAMA 1989;261:878-83
2075 152. Robbins J, Cromwell P and Korones DN. Swimming and central venous catheter-
2076 related infections in the child with cancer. J Pediatr Oncol Nurs 1999;16:51-6
2077 153. Howell PB, Walters PE, Donowitz GR and Farr BM. Risk factors for infection of
2078 adult patients with cancer who have tunnelled central venous catheters. Cancer
2079 1995;75:1367-75
2080 154. Rao SP, Oreopoulos DG. Unusual complications of a polyurethane PD catheter.
2081 Perit Dial Int 1997;17:410-2
2082 155. Riu S, Ruiz CG, Martinez-Vea A, Peralta C and Oliver JA. Spontaneous rupture of
2083 polyurethane peritoneal catheter. A possible deleterious effect of mupirocin ointment.
2084 Nephrol Dial Transplant 1998;13:1870-1
2085 156. Timsit JF, Schwebel C, Bouadma L, et al. Chlorhexidine-impregnated sponges and
2086 less frequent dressing changes for prevention of catheter-related infections in critically ill
2087 adults: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA 2009;301:1231-41
2088 157. Ho KM, Litton E. Use of chlorhexidine-impregnated dressing to prevent vascular
2089 and epidural catheter colonization and infection: a meta-analysis. J Antimicrob
2090 Chemother 2006;58:281-7
2091 158. Levy I, Katz J, Solter E, et al. Chlorhexidine-impregnated dressing for prevention of
2092 colonization of central venous catheters in infants and children: a randomized controlled
2093 study. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2005;24:676-9

Formatted: Italian (Italy)

159. Hoffmann KK, Weber DJ, Samsa GP and Rutala WA. Transparent polyurethane film as an intravenous catheter dressing. A meta-analysis of the infection risks. JAMA 1992;267:2072-6

160. Gillies D, O'Riordan E, Carr D, O'Brien I, Frost J and Gunning R. Central venous catheter dressings: a systematic review. J Adv Nurs 2003;44:623-32

161. Ruschulte H, Franke M, Gastmeier P, et al. Prevention of central venous catheter-related infections with chlorhexidine gluconate impregnated wound dressings: a randomized controlled trial. Ann Hematol 2009;88:267-72

162. Bleasdale SC, Trick WE, Gonzalez IM, Lyles RD, Hayden MK and Weinstein RA. Effectiveness of chlorhexidine bathing to reduce catheter-associated bloodstream infections in medical intensive care unit patients. Arch Intern Med 2007;167:2073-9

163. Yamamoto AJ, Solomon JA, Soulen MC, et al. Sutureless securement device reduces complications of peripherally inserted central venous catheters. J Vasc Interv Radiol 2002;13:77-81

164. Raad I, Darouiche R, Dupuis J, et al. Central venous catheters coated with minocycline and rifampin for the prevention of catheter-related colonization and bloodstream infections. A randomized, double-blind trial. The Texas Medical Center Catheter Study Group. Ann Intern Med 1997;127:267-74

165. Bhutta A, Gilliam C, Honeycutt M, et al. Reduction of bloodstream infections associated with catheters in paediatric intensive care unit: stepwise approach. Bmj 2007;334:362-5

Formatted: German (Germany)

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

Formatted: Italian (Italy)

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

166. Chelliah A, Heydon KH, Zaoutis TE, et al. Observational trial of antibiotic-coated central venous catheters in critically ill pediatric patients. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2007;26:816-20

167. Veenstra DL, Saint S, Saha S, Lumley T and Sullivan SD. Efficacy of antiseptic-impregnated central venous catheters in preventing catheter-related bloodstream infection: a meta-analysis. JAMA 1999;281:261-7

168. Maki DG, Stolz SM, Wheeler S and Mermel LA. Prevention of central venous catheter-related bloodstream infection by use of an antiseptic-impregnated catheter. A randomized, controlled trial. Ann Intern Med 1997;127:257-66

169. Brun-Buisson C, Doyon F, Sollet JP, Cochard JF, Cohen Y and Nitenberg G. Prevention of intravascular catheter-related infection with newer chlorhexidine-silver sulfadiazine-coated catheters: a randomized controlled trial. Intensive Care Med 2004;30:837-43

170. Ostendorf T, Meinhold A, Harter C, et al. Chlorhexidine and silver-sulfadiazine coated central venous catheters in haematological patients--a double-blind, randomised, prospective, controlled trial. Support Care Cancer 2005;13:993-1000

171. Rupp ME, Lisco SJ, Lipsett PA, et al. Effect of a second-generation venous catheter impregnated with chlorhexidine and silver sulfadiazine on central catheter-related infections: a randomized, controlled trial. Ann Intern Med 2005;143:570-80

172. Bassetti S, Hu J, D'Agostino RB, Jr. and Sherertz RJ. Prolonged antimicrobial activity of a catheter containing chlorhexidine-silver sulfadiazine extends protection against catheter infections in vivo. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2001;45:1535-8.

173. Oda T, Hamasaki J, Kanda N and Mikami K. Anaphylactic shock induced by an antiseptic-coated central venous [correction of nervous] catheter. Anesthesiology 1997;87:1242-4.

174. Pittaway A, Ford S. Allergy to chlorhexidine-coated central venous catheters revisited. Br J Anaesth 2002;88:304-5; author reply 305

175. Stephens R, Mythen M, Kallis P, Davies DW, Egner W and Rickards A. Two episodes of life-threatening anaphylaxis in the same patient to a chlorhexidine-sulphadiazine-coated central venous catheter. Br J Anaesth 2001;87:306-8

176. Terazawa E, Shimonaka H, Nagase K, Masue T and Dohi S. Severe anaphylactic reaction due to a chlorhexidine-impregnated central venous catheter. Anesthesiology 1998;89:1296-8

177. Veenstra DL, Saint S and Sullivan SD. Cost-effectiveness of antiseptic-impregnated central venous catheters for the prevention of catheter-related bloodstream infection. JAMA 1999;282:554-60

178. Darouiche RO, Raad, II, Heard SO, et al. A comparison of two antimicrobial-impregnated central venous catheters. Catheter Study Group. N Engl J Med 1999;340:1-8

179. Hanna H, Benjamin R, Chatzinikolaou I, et al. Long-term silicone central venous catheters impregnated with minocycline and rifampin decrease rates of catheter-related bloodstream infection in cancer patients: a prospective randomized clinical trial. J Clin Oncol 2004;22:3163-71

180. Tambe SM, Sampath L and Modak SM. In vitro evaluation of the risk of developing bacterial resistance to antiseptics and antibiotics used in medical devices. J Antimicrob Chemother 2001;47:589-98

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

2160 181. Sampath LA, Tambe SM and Modak SM. In vitro and in vivo efficacy of catheters
2161 impregnated with antiseptics or antibiotics: evaluation of the risk of bacterial resistance to
2162 the antimicrobials in the catheters. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2001;22:640-6
2163 182. Marciante KD, Veenstra DL, Lipsky BA and Saint S. Which antimicrobial
2164 impregnated central venous catheter should we use? Modeling the costs and outcomes of
2165 antimicrobial catheter use. Am J Infect Control 2003;31:1-8
2166 183. Shorr AF, Humphreys CW and Helman DL. New choices for central venous
2167 catheters: potential financial implications. Chest 2003;124:275-84
2168 184. Hagau N, Studnicska D, Gavrus RL, Csipak G, Hagau R and Slavcovici AV. Central
2169 venous catheter colonization and catheter-related bloodstream infections in critically ill
2170 patients: a comparison between standard and silver-integrated catheters. Eur J
2171 Anaesthesiol 2009;26:752-8
2172 185. Bong JJ, Kite P, Wilco MH and McMahon MJ. Prevention of catheter-related
2173 bloodstream infection by silver iontophoretic central venous catheters: a randomised
2174 controlled trial. J Clin Pathol 2003;56:731-5
2175 186. Corral L, Nolla-Salas M, Ibanez-Nolla J, et al. A prospective, randomized study in
2176 critically ill patients using the Oligon Vantex catheter. J Hosp Infect 2003;55:212-9
2177 187. Ranucci M, Isgro G, Giomarelli PP, et al. Impact of oligon central venous catheters
2178 on catheter colonization and catheter-related bloodstream infection. Crit Care Med
2179 2003;31:52-9
2180 188. van de Wetering MD, van Woensel JB. Prophylactic antibiotics for preventing early
2181 central venous catheter Gram positive infections in oncology patients. Cochrane Database
2182 Syst Rev 2007:CD003295

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

189. Raad, II, Hachem RY, Abi-Said D, et al. A prospective crossover randomized trial of novobiocin and rifampin prophylaxis for the prevention of intravascular catheter infections in cancer patients treated with interleukin-2. Cancer 1998;82:403-11

190. McKee R, Dunsmuir R, Whitby M and Garden OJ. Does antibiotic prophylaxis at the time of catheter insertion reduce the incidence of catheter-related sepsis in intravenous nutrition? J Hosp Infect 1985;6:419-25

191. Sandoe JA, Kumar B, Stoddart B, et al. Effect of extended perioperative antibiotic prophylaxis on intravascular catheter colonization and infection in cardiothoracic surgery patients. J Antimicrob Chemother 2003;52:877-9

192. Inglis GD, Jardine LA and Davies MW. Prophylactic antibiotics to reduce morbidity and mortality in neonates with umbilical artery catheters. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2007:CD004697

193. Craft AP, Finer NN and Barrington KJ. Vancomycin for prophylaxis against sepsis in preterm neonates. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2000:CD001971

194. Fukunaga A, Naritaka H, Fukaya R, Tabuse M and Nakamura T. Povidone-iodine ointment and gauze dressings associated with reduced catheter-related infection in seriously ill neurosurgical patients. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2004;25:696-8

195. Johnson DW, MacGinley R, Kay TD, et al. A randomized controlled trial of topical exit site mupirocin application in patients with tunnelled, cuffed haemodialysis catheters. Nephrol Dial Transplant 2002;17:1802-7

196. Fong IW. Prevention of haemodialysis and peritoneal dialysis catheter-related infection by topical povidone-iodine. Postgrad Med J 1993;69 Suppl 3:S15-7

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

Formatted: Portuguese (Brazil)

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

2205 197. Levin A, Mason AJ, Jindal KK, Fong IW and Goldstein MB. Prevention of
2206 hemodialysis subclavian vein catheter infections by topical povidone-iodine. Kidney Int
2207 1991;40:934-8
2208 198. National Kidney Foundation. III. NKF-K/DOQI Clinical Practice Guidelines for
2209 Vascular Access: update 2000. Am J Kidney Dis 2001;37:S137-81.
2210 199. Norden CW. Application of antibiotic ointment to the site of venous catheterization-
2211 -a controlled trial. J Infect Dis 1969;120:611-5.
2212 200. Zinner SH, Denny-Brown BC, Braun P, Burke JP, Toala P and Kass EH. Risk of
2213 infection with intravenous indwelling catheters: effect of application of antibiotic
2214 ointment. J Infect Dis 1969;120:616-9.
2215 201. von Eiff C, Becker K, Machka K, Stammer H and Peters G. Nasal Carriage as a
2216 Source of Staphylococcus aureus Bacteremia. N Engl J Med 2001;344:11-16.
2217 202. Chow JW, Yu VL. Staphylococcus aureus nasal carriage in hemodialysis patients.
2218 Its role in infection and approaches to prophylaxis. Arch Intern Med 1989;149:1258-62
2219 203. Yu VL, Goetz A, Wagener M, et al. Staphylococcus aureus nasal carriage and
2220 infection in patients on hemodialysis. Efficacy of antibiotic prophylaxis. N Engl J Med
2221 1986;315:91-6
2222 204. Casewell MW. The nose: an underestimated source of Staphylococcus aureus
2223 causing wound infection. J Hosp Infect 1998;40:S3-11
2224 205. Hill RL, Fisher AP, Ware RJ, Wilson S and Casewell MW. Mupirocin for the
2225 reduction of colonization of internal jugular cannulae--a randomized controlled trial. J
2226 Hosp Infect 1990;15:311-21

Formatted: French (France)

2227 206. Sesso R, Barbosa D, Leme IL, et al. Staphylococcus aureus prophylaxis in
2228 hemodialysis patients using central venous catheter: effect of mupirocin ointment. J Am
2229 Soc Nephrol 1998;9:1085-92

2230 207. Boelaert JR, Van Landuyt HW, Godard CA, et al. Nasal mupirocin ointment
2231 decreases the incidence of Staphylococcus aureus bacteraemias in haemodialysis patients.
2232 Nephrol Dial Transplant 1993;8:235-9

2233 208. Netto dos Santos KR, de Souza Fonseca L and Gontijo Filho PP. Emergence of
2234 high-level mupirocin resistance in methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus isolated
2235 from Brazilian university hospitals. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 1996;17:813-6

2236 209. Miller MA, Dascal A, Portnoy J and Mendelson J. Development of mupirocin
2237 resistance among methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus after widespread use of
2238 nasal mupirocin ointment. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 1996;17:811-3

2239 210. Lok CE, Stanley KE, Hux JE, Richardson R, Tobe SW and Conly J. Hemodialysis
2240 infection prevention with polysporin ointment. J Am Soc Nephrol 2003;14:169-79

2241 211. Schwartz C, Henrickson KJ, Roghmann K and Powell K. Prevention of bacteremia
2242 attributed to luminal colonization of tunneled central venous catheters with vancomycin-
2243 susceptible organisms. J Clin Oncol 1990;8:1591-7

2244 212. Rackoff WR, Weiman M, Jakobowski D, et al. A randomized, controlled trial of the
2245 efficacy of a heparin and vancomycin solution in preventing central venous catheter
2246 infections in children. J Pediatr 1995;127:147-51

2247 213. Carratala J, Niubo J, Fernandez-Sevilla A, et al. Randomized, double-blind trial of
2248 an antibiotic-lock technique for prevention of gram-positive central venous catheter-

Formatted: Portuguese (Brazil)

Formatted: Portuguese (Brazil)

2249 related infection in neutropenic patients with cancer. Antimicrob Agents Chemother
2250 1999;43:2200-4
2251 214. Jurewitsch B, Lee T, Park J and Jeejeebhoy K. Taurolidine 2% as an antimicrobial
2252 lock solution for prevention of recurrent catheter-related bloodstream infections. J
2253 Parenter Enteral Nutr 1998;22:242-4
2254 215. Henrickson KJ, Axtell RA, Hoover SM, et al. Prevention of central venous catheter-
2255 related infections and thrombotic events in immunocompromised children by the use of
2256 vancomycin/ciprofloxacin/heparin flush solution: A randomized, multicenter, double-
2257 blind trial. J Clin Oncol 2000;18:1269-78
2258 216. Daghistani D, Horn M, Rodriguez Z, Schoenike S and Toledano S. Prevention of
2259 indwelling central venous catheter sepsis. Med Pediatr Oncol 1996;26:405-8
2260 217. Barriga FJ, Varas M, Potin M, et al. Efficacy of a vancomycin solution to prevent
2261 bacteremia associated with an indwelling central venous catheter in neutropenic and non-
2262 neutropenic cancer patients. Med Pediatr Oncol 1997;28:196-200
2263 218. Dogra GK, Herson H, Hutchison B, et al. Prevention of tunneled hemodialysis
2264 catheter-related infections using catheter-restricted filling with gentamicin and citrate: a
2265 randomized controlled study. J Am Soc Nephrol 2002;13:2133-9
2266 219. Allon M. Prophylaxis against dialysis catheter-related bacteremia with a novel
2267 antimicrobial lock solution. Clin Infect Dis 2003;36:1539-44
2268 220. Elhassan NO, Stevens TP, Gigliotti F, Hardy DJ, Cole CA and Sinkin RA.
2269 Vancomycin usage in central venous catheters in a neonatal intensive care unit. Pediatr
2270 Infect Dis J 2004;23:201-6

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

2271 221. McIntyre CW, Hulme LJ, Taal M and Fluck RJ. Locking of tunneled hemodialysis
2272 catheters with gentamicin and heparin. Kidney Int 2004;66:801-5

2273 222. Betjes MG, van Agteren M. Prevention of dialysis catheter-related sepsis with a
2274 citrate-taurolidine-containing lock solution. Nephrol Dial Transplant 2004;19:1546-51
2275 223. Weijmer MC, van den Dorpel MA, Van de Ven PJ, et al. Randomized, clinical trial
2276 comparison of trisodium citrate 30% and heparin as catheter-locking solution in

2277 hemodialysis patients. J Am Soc Nephrol 2005;16:2769-77
2278 224. Bleyer AJ, Mason L, Russell G, Raad, II and Sherertz RJ. A randomized, controlled
2279 trial of a new vascular catheter flush solution (minocycline-EDTA) in temporary

2280 hemodialysis access. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2005;26:520-4
2281 225. Kim SH, Song KI, Chang JW, et al. Prevention of uncuffed hemodialysis catheter-
2282 related bacteremia using an antibiotic lock technique: a prospective, randomized clinical
2283 trial. Kidney Int 2006;69:161-4
2284 226. Al-Hwiesh AK, Abdul-Rahman IS. Successful prevention of tunneled, central
2285 catheter infection by antibiotic lock therapy using vancomycin and gentamycin. Saudi J
2286 Kidney Dis Transpl 2007;18:239-47

2287 227. Nori US, Manoharan A, Yee J and Besarab A. Comparison of low-dose gentamicin
2288 with minocycline as catheter lock solutions in the prevention of catheter-related

2289 bacteremia. Am J Kidney Dis 2006;48:596-605
2290 228. Saxena AK, Panhotra BR, Sundaram DS, et al. Tunneled catheters' outcome
2291 optimization among diabetics on dialysis through antibiotic-lock placement. Kidney Int
2292 2006;70:1629-35

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

2293 229. Yahav D, Rozen-Zvi B, Gafter-Gvili A, Leibovici L, Gafter U and Paul M.
2294 Antimicrobial lock solutions for the prevention of infections associated with intravascular
2295 catheters in patients undergoing hemodialysis: systematic review and meta-analysis of
2296 randomized, controlled trials. Clin Infect Dis 2008;47:83-93

2297 230. Labriola L, Crott R and Jadoul M. Preventing haemodialysis catheter-related
2298 bacteraemia with an antimicrobial lock solution: a meta-analysis of prospective
2299 randomized trials. Nephrol Dial Transplant 2008;23:1666-72

2300 231. Jaffer Y, Selby NM, Taal MW, Fluck RJ and McIntyre CW. A meta-analysis of
2301 hemodialysis catheter locking solutions in the prevention of catheter-related infection.
2302 Am J Kidney Dis 2008;51:233-41

2303 232. Safdar N, Maki DG. Use of vancomycin-containing lock or flush solutions for
2304 prevention of bloodstream infection associated with central venous access devices: a
2305 meta-analysis of prospective, randomized trials. Clin Infect Dis 2006;43:474-84
2306 233. Sanders J, Pithie A, Ganly P, et al. A prospective double-blind randomized trial
2307 comparing intraluminal ethanol with heparinized saline for the prevention of catheter-
2308 associated bloodstream infection in immunosuppressed haematology patients. J
2309 Antimicrob Chemother 2008;62:809-15
2310 234. Randolph AG, Cook DJ, Gonzales CA and Andrew M. Benefit of heparin in central
2311 venous and pulmonary artery catheters: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials.
2312 Chest 1998;113:165-71
2313 235. Schinabeck MK gM. Biofilm-Related Indwelling Medical Device Infections. In:
2314 Pace JL RM, Finch RG, ed. Biofilms, Infection, and Antimicrobial Therapy. Boca Raton:
2315 Taylor and Francis, 2006:39-50

236. Gristina AG. Biomaterial-centered infection: microbial adhesion versus tissue integration. Science 1987;237:1588-95

237. Timsit JF, Farkas JC, Boyer JM, et al. Central vein catheter-related thrombosis in intensive care patients: incidence, risks factors, and relationship with catheter-related sepsis. Chest 1998;114:207-13

238. Eastman ME, Khorsand M, Maki DG, et al. Central venous device-related infection and thrombosis in patients treated with moderate dose continuous-infusion interleukin-2. Cancer 2001;91:806-14

239. Abdelkefi A, Torjman L, Ladeb S, et al. Randomized trial of prevention of catheter-related bloodstream infection by continuous infusion of low-dose unfractionated heparin in patients with hematologic and oncologic disease. J Clin Oncol 2005;23:7864-70

240. Mermel LA, Stolz SM and Maki DG. Surface antimicrobial activity of heparin-bonded and antiseptic-impregnated vascular catheters. J Infect Dis 1993;167:920-4.

241. Pierce CM, Wade A and Mok Q. Heparin-bonded central venous lines reduce thrombotic and infective complications in critically ill children. Intensive Care Med 2000;26:967-72.

242. Appelgren P, Ransjo U, Bindslev L, Espersen F and Larm O. Surface heparinization of central venous catheters reduces microbial colonization in vitro and in vivo: results from a prospective, randomized trial. Crit Care Med 1996;24:1482-9

243. Abdelkefi A, Achour W, Ben Othman T, et al. Use of heparin-coated central venous lines to prevent catheter-related bloodstream infection. J Support Oncol 2007;5:273-8

Formatted: Italian (Italy)

2337 244. Carrasco MN, Bueno A, de las Cuevas C, et al. Evaluation of a triple-lumen central
2338 venous heparin-coated catheter versus a catheter coated with chlorhexidine and silver
2339 sulfadiazine in critically ill patients. Intensive Care Med 2004;30:633-8

2340 245. Levy JH, Hursting MJ. Heparin-induced thrombocytopenia, a prothrombotic disease.
2341 Hematol Oncol Clin North Am 2007;21:65-88

2342 246. Weijmer MC, Debets-Ossenkopp YJ, Van De Vondervoort FJ and ter Wee PM.
2343 Superior antimicrobial activity of trisodium citrate over heparin for catheter locking.
2344 Nephrol Dial Transplant 2002;17:2189-95

2345 247. Boraks P, Seale J, Price J, et al. Prevention of central venous catheter associated
2346 thrombosis using minidose warfarin in patients with haematological malignancies. Br J
2347 Haematol 1998;101:483-6

2348 248. Bern MM, Lokich JJ, Wallach SR, et al. Very low doses of warfarin can prevent
2349 thrombosis in central venous catheters. A randomized prospective trial. Ann Intern Med
2350 1990;112:423-8

2351 249. Akl EA, Karmath G, Yosuico V, et al. Anticoagulation for thrombosis prophylaxis
2352 in cancer patients with central venous catheters. Cochrane Database Syst Rev
2353 2007:CD006468

2354 250. Akl EA, Muti P and Schunemann HJ. Anticoagulation in patients with cancer: an
2355 overview of reviews. Pol Arch Med Wewn 2008;118:183-93

2356 251. Klerk CP, Smorenburg SM and Buller HR. Thrombosis prophylaxis in patient
2357 populations with a central venous catheter: a systematic review. Arch Intern Med
2358 2003;163:1913-21

Formatted: German (Germany)

2359 252. Heaton DC, Han DY and Inder A. Minidose (1 mg) warfarin as prophylaxis for
2360 central vein catheter thrombosis. Intern Med J 2002;32:84-8
2361 253. Masci G, Magagnoli M, Zucali PA, et al. Minidose warfarin prophylaxis for
2362 catheter-associated thrombosis in cancer patients: can it be safely associated with
2363 fluorouracil-based chemotherapy? J Clin Oncol 2003;21:736-9
2364 254. Kuter DJ. Thrombotic complications of central venous catheters in cancer patients.
2365 Oncologist 2004;9:207-16

2366 255. Maki DG, Botticelli JT, LeRoy ML and Thielke TS. Prospective study of replacing
2367 administration sets for intravenous therapy at 48- vs 72-hour intervals. 72 hours is safe
2368 and cost-effective. JAMA 1987;258:1777-81
2369 256. Collin J, Collin C. Infusion thrombophlebitis. Lancet 1975;2:458
2370 257. Lai KK. Safety of prolonging peripheral cannula and i.v. tubing use from 72 hours
2371 to 96 hours. Am J Infect Control 1998;26:66-70

2372 258. Fontaine PJ. Performance of a new softening expanding midline catheter in home
2373 intravenous therapy patients. J Intraven Nurs 1991;14:91-9

2374 259. Harwood IR, Greene LM, Kozakowski-Koch JA and Rasor JS. New peripherally
2375 inserted midline catheter: a better alternative for intravenous antibiotic therapy in patients
2376 with cystic fibrosis. Pediatr Pulmonol 1992;12:233-9
2377 260. Mermel LA, Parenteau S and Tow SM. The risk of midline catheterization in
2378 hospitalized patients. A prospective study. Ann Intern Med 1995;123:841-4

2379 261. Uldall PR, Merchant N, Woods F, Yarworski U and Vas S. Changing subclavian
2380 haemodialysis cannulas to reduce infection. Lancet 1981;1:1373

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

2381 262. Eyer S, Brummitt C, Crossley K, Siegel R and Cerra F. Catheter-related sepsis:
2382 prospective, randomized study of three methods of long-term catheter maintenance. Crit
2383 Care Med 1990;18:1073-9

2384 263. Cook D, Randolph A, Kernerman P, et al. Central venous catheter replacement
2385 strategies: a systematic review of the literature. Crit Care Med 1997;25:1417-24

2386 264. Cobb DK, High KP, Sawyer RG, et al. A controlled trial of scheduled replacement
2387 of central venous and pulmonary-artery catheters. N Engl J Med 1992;327:1062-8

2388 265. Beathard GA. Management of bacteremia associated with tunneled-cuffed
2389 hemodialysis catheters. J Am Soc Nephrol 1999;10:1045-9

2390 266. Duszak R, Jr., Haskal ZJ, Thomas-Hawkins C, et al. Replacement of failing tunneled
2391 hemodialysis catheters through pre-existing subcutaneous tunnels: a comparison of
2392 catheter function and infection rates for de novo placements and over-the-wire
2393 exchanges. J Vasc Interv Radiol 1998;9:321-7

2394 267. Robinson D, Suhocki P and Schwab SJ. Treatment of infected tunneled venous
2395 access hemodialysis catheters with guidewire exchange. Kidney Int 1998;53:1792-4
2396 268. Saad TF. Bacteremia associated with tunneled, cuffed hemodialysis catheters. Am J
2397 Kidney Dis 1999;34:1114-24

2398 269. Ainsworth SB, Clerihew L and McGuire W. Percutaneous central venous catheters
2399 versus peripheral cannulae for delivery of parenteral nutrition in neonates. Cochrane
2400 Database Syst Rev 2007:CD004219

2401 270. Shah PS, Kalyn A, Satodia P, et al. A randomized, controlled trial of heparin versus
2402 placebo infusion to prolong the usability of peripherally placed percutaneous central

2403 venous catheters (PCVCs) in neonates: the HIP (Heparin Infusion for PCVC) study.
2404 Pediatrics 2007;119:e284-91

2405 271. Jaar BG, Hermann JA, Furth SL, Briggs W and Powe NR. Septicemia in diabetic
2406 hemodialysis patients: comparison of incidence, risk factors, and mortality with
2407 nondiabetic hemodialysis patients. Am J Kidney Dis 2000;35:282-92.

2408 272. Powe NR, Jaar B, Furth SL, Hermann J and Briggs W. Septicemia in dialysis
2409 patients: incidence, risk factors, and prognosis. Kidney Int 1999;55:1081-90.

2410 273. Hoen B, Paul-Dauphin A, Hestin D and Kessler M. EPIBACDIAL: a multicenter
2411 prospective study of risk factors for bacteremia in chronic hemodialysis patients. J Am
2412 Soc Nephrol 1998;9:869-76

2413 274. Blot F, Chachaty E, Raynard B, Antoun S, Bourgain JL and Nitenberg G.
2414 Mechanisms and risk factors for infection of pulmonary artery catheters and introducer
2415 sheaths in cancer patients admitted to an intensive care unit. J Hosp Infect 2001;48:289-
2416 97

2417 275. Kac G, Durain E, Amrein C, Herisson E, Fiemeyer A and Buu-Hoi A. Colonization
2418 and infection of pulmonary artery catheter in cardiac surgery patients: epidemiology and
2419 multivariate analysis of risk factors. Crit Care Med 2001;29:971-5

2420 276. Raad I, Umphrey J, Khan A, Truett LJ and Bodey GP. The duration of placement as
2421 a predictor of peripheral and pulmonary arterial catheter infections. J Hosp Infect
2422 1993;23:17-26

2423 277. Chen YY, Yen DH, Yang YG, Liu CY, Wang FD and Chou P. Comparison between
2424 replacement at 4 days and 7 days of the infection rate for pulmonary artery catheters in an
2425 intensive care unit. Crit Care Med 2003;31:1353-8

2426 278. Boo NY, Wong NC, Zulkifli SS and Lye MS. Risk factors associated with umbilical
2427 vascular catheter-associated thrombosis in newborn infants. J Paediatr Child Health
2428 1999;35:460-5
2429 279. Garland JS, Buck RK, Maloney P, et al. Comparison of 10% povidone-iodine and
2430 0.5% chlorhexidine gluconate for the prevention of peripheral intravenous catheter
2431 colonization in neonates: a prospective trial. Pediatr Infect Dis J 1995;14:510-6
2432 280. Krauss AN, Albert RF and Kannan MM. Contamination of umbilical catheters in the
2433 newborn infant. J Pediatr 1970;77:965-9
2434 281. Landers S, Moise AA, Fraley JK, Smith EO and Baker CJ. Factors associated with
2435 umbilical catheter-related sepsis in neonates. Am J Dis Child 1991;145:675-80
2436 282. Cronin WA, Germanson TP and Donowitz LG. Intravascular catheter colonization
2437 and related bloodstream infection in critically ill neonates. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol
2438 1990;11:301-8
2439 283. Miller KL, Coen PE, White WJ, Hurst WJ, Achey BE and Lang CM. Effectiveness
2440 of skin absorption of tincture of I in blocking radioiodine from the human thyroid gland.
2441 Health Phys 1989;56:911-4
2442 284. Ankola PA, Atakent YS. Effect of adding heparin in very low concentration to the
2443 infusate to prolong the patency of umbilical artery catheters. Am J Perinatol
2444 1993;10:229-32.
2445 285. David RJ, Merten DF, Anderson JC and Gross S. Prevention of umbilical artery
2446 catheter clots with heparinized infusates. Dev Pharmacol Ther 1981;2:117-26.

2447 286. Horgan MJ, Bartoletti A, Polansky S, Peters JC, Manning TJ and Lamont BM.
2448 Effect of heparin infusates in umbilical arterial catheters on frequency of thrombotic
2449 complications. J Pediatr 1987;111:774-8.

2450 287. Fletcher MA, Brown DR, Landers S and Seguin J. Umbilical arterial catheter use:
2451 report of an audit conducted by the Study Group for Complications of Perinatal Care. Am
2452 J Perinatol 1994;11:94-9

2453 288. Seguin J, Fletcher MA, Landers S, Brown D and Macpherson T. Umbilical venous
2454 catheterizations: audit by the Study Group for Complications of Perinatal Care. Am J
2455 Perinatol 1994;11:67-70

2456 289. Loisel DB, Smith MM, MacDonald MG and Martin GR. Intravenous access in
2457 newborn infants: impact of extended umbilical venous catheter use on requirement for
2458 peripheral venous lines. J Perinatol 1996;16:461-6

2459 290. Balagtas RC, Bell CE, Edwards LD and Levin S. Risk of local and systemic
2460 infections associated with umbilical vein catheterization: a prospective study in 86
2461 newborn patients. Pediatrics 1971;48:359-67

2462 291. Butler-O'Hara M, Buzzard CJ, Reubens L, McDermott MP, DiGrazio W and
2463 D'Angio CT. A randomized trial comparing long-term and short-term use of umbilical
2464 venous catheters in premature infants with birth weights of less than 1251 grams.
2465 Pediatrics 2006;118:e25-35

2466 292. Martin C, Saux P, Papazian L and Gouin F. Long-term arterial cannulation in ICU
2467 patients using the radial artery or dorsalis pedis artery. Chest 2001;119:901-6

2468 293. Koh DB, Gowardman JR, Rickard CM, Robertson IK and Brown A. Prospective
2469 study of peripheral arterial catheter infection and comparison with concurrently sited
2470 central venous catheters. Crit Care Med 2008;36:397-402

2471 294. Donowitz LG, Marsik FJ, Hoyt JW and Wenzel RP. Serratia marcescens bacteremia
2472 from contaminated pressure transducers. JAMA 1979;242:1749-51

2473 295. Luskin RL, Weinstein RA, Nathan C, Chamberlin WH and Kabins SA. Extended
2474 use of disposable pressure transducers. A bacteriologic evaluation. JAMA 1986;255:916-
2475 20

2476 296. Maki DG, Hassemer CA. Endemic rate of fluid contamination and related
2477 septicemia in arterial pressure monitoring. Am J Med 1981;70:733-8

2478 297. Mermel LA, Maki DG. Epidemic bloodstream infections from hemodynamic
2479 pressure monitoring: signs of the times. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 1989;10:47-53

2480 298. Tenold R, Priano L, Kim K, Rourke B and Marrone T. Infection potential of
2481 nondisposable pressure transducers prepared prior to use. Crit Care Med 1987;15:582-3

2482 299. Thomas F, Burke JP, Parker J, et al. The risk of infection related to radial vs femoral
2483 sites for arterial catheterization. Crit Care Med 1983;11:807-12

2484 300. Leroy O, Billiau V, Beuscart C, et al. Nosocomial infections associated with long-
2485 term radial artery cannulation. Intensive Care Med 1989;15:241-6

2486 301. Fisher MC, Long SS, Roberts EM, Dunn JM and Balsara RK. Pseudomonas
2487 maltophilia bacteremia in children undergoing open heart surgery. JAMA
2488 1981;246:1571-4

Formatted: French (France)

2489 302. Stamm WE, Colella JJ, Anderson RL and Dixon RE. Indwelling arterial catheters as
2490 a source of nosocomial bacteremia. An outbreak caused by Flavobacterium Species. N
2491 Engl J Med 1975;292:1099-102

2492 303. Weinstein RA, Emori TG, Anderson RL and Stamm WE. Pressure transducers as a
2493 source of bacteremia after open heart surgery. Report of an outbreak and guidelines for
2494 prevention. Chest 1976;69:338-44
2495 304. Shinozaki T, Deane RS, Mazuzan JE, Jr., Hamel AJ and Hazelton D. Bacterial
2496 contamination of arterial lines. A prospective study. JAMA 1983;249:223-5

2497 305. Solomon SL, Alexander H, Eley JW, et al. Nosocomial fungemia in neonates
2498 associated with intravascular pressure-monitoring devices. Pediatr Infect Dis 1986;5:680-
2499 5

2500 306. Weems JJ, Jr., Chamberland ME, Ward J, Willy M, Padhye AA and Solomon SL.
2501 Candida parapsilosis fungemia associated with parenteral nutrition and contaminated
2502 blood pressure transducers. J Clin Microbiol 1987;25:1029-32
2503 307. Villarino ME, Jarvis WR, O'Hara C, Bresnahan J and Clark N. Epidemic of Serratia
2504 marcescens bacteremia in a cardiac intensive care unit. J Clin Microbiol 1989;27:2433-6
2505 308. Beck-Sague CM, Jarvis WR, Brook JH, et al. Epidemic bacteremia due to

2506 Acinetobacter baumannii in five intensive care units. Am J Epidemiol 1990;132:723-33
2507 309. Rijnders BJ, Van Wijngaerden E, Wilmer A and Peetermans WE. Use of full sterile

2508 barrier precautions during insertion of arterial catheters: a randomized trial. Clin Infect
2509 Dis 2003;36:743-8

2510 310. Scheer B, Perel A and Pfeiffer UJ. Clinical review: complications and risk factors of
2511 peripheral arterial catheters used for haemodynamic monitoring in anaesthesia and
2512 intensive care medicine. Crit Care 2002;6:199-204

2513 311. Lorente L, Santacreu R, Martin MM, Jimenez A and Mora ML. Arterial catheter-
2514 related infection of 2,949 catheters. Crit Care 2006;10:R83

2515 312. Furfaro S, Gauthier M, Lacroix J, Nadeau D, Lafleur L and Mathews S. Arterial
2516 catheter-related infections in children. A 1-year cohort analysis. Am J Dis Child
2517 1991;145:1037-43

2518 313. Gillies D, O'Riordan L, Wallen M, Morrison A, Rankin K and Nagy S. Optimal
2519 timing for intravenous administration set replacement. Cochrane Database Syst Rev
2520 2005:CD003588

2521 314. Sitges-Serra A, Linares J, Perez JL, Jaurrieta E and Lorente L. A randomized trial on
2522 the effect of tubing changes on hub contamination and catheter sepsis during parenteral
2523 nutrition. JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr 1985;9:322-5

2524 315. Snydman DR, Donnelly-Reidy M, Perry LK and Martin WJ. Intravenous tubing
2525 containing burettes can be safely changed at 72 hour intervals. Infect Control 1987;8:113-
2526 6

2527 316. Josephson A, Gombert ME, Sierra MF, Karanfil LV and Tansino GF. The
2528 relationship between intravenous fluid contamination and the frequency of tubing
2529 replacement. Infect Control 1985;6:367-70

2530 317. Melly MA, Meng HC and Schaffner W. Microbiol growth in lipid emulsions used in
2531 parenteral nutrition. Arch Surg 1975;110:1479-81

2532 318. Mershon J, Nogami W, Williams JM, Yoder C, Eitzen HE and Lemons JA.
2533 Bacterial/fungal growth in a combined parenteral nutrition solution. JPEN J Parenter
2534 Enteral Nutr 1986;10:498-502

2535 319. Gilbert M, Gallagher SC, Eads M and Elmore MF. Microbial growth patterns in a
2536 total parenteral nutrition formulation containing lipid emulsion. JPEN J Parenter Enteral
2537 Nutr 1986;10:494-7

2538 320. Maki DG, Martin WT. Nationwide epidemic of septicemia caused by contaminated
2539 infusion products. IV. Growth of microbial pathogens in fluids for intravenous infusions.
2540 J Infect Dis 1975;131:267-72

2541 321. Bennett SN, McNeil MM, Bland LA, et al. Postoperative infections traced to
2542 contamination of an intravenous anesthetic, propofol. N Engl J Med 1995;333:147-54

2543 322. Rickard CM, Lipman J, Courtney M, Siversen R and Daley P. Routine changing of
2544 intravenous administration sets does not reduce colonization or infection in central
2545 venous catheters. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2004;25:650-5

2546 323. Hanna HA, Raad I. Blood products: a significant risk factor for long-term catheter-
2547 related bloodstream infections in cancer patients. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol
2548 2001;22:165-6.

2549 324. Saiman L, Ludington E, Dawson JD, et al. Risk factors for Candida species
2550 colonization of neonatal intensive care unit patients. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2001;20:1119-
2551 24.

2552 325. Avila-Figueroa C, Goldmann DA, Richardson DK, Gray JE, Ferrari A and Freeman
2553 J. Intravenous lipid emulsions are the major determinant of coagulase-negative

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

staphylococcal bacteremia in very low birth weight newborns. Pediatr Infect Dis J 1998;17:10-7.

326. Crocker KS, Noga R, Filibeck DJ, Krey SH, Markovic M and Steffee WP. Microbial growth comparisons of five commercial parenteral lipid emulsions. J Parenter Enteral Nutr 1984;8:391-5

327. Jarvis WR, Highsmith AK. Bacterial growth and endotoxin production in lipid emulsion. J Clin Microbiol 1984;19:17-20

328. Arduino MJ, Bland LA, Danzig LE, McAllister SK and Aguero SM. Microbiologic evaluation of needleless and needle-access devices. Am J Infect Control 1997;25:377-80

329. Brown JD, Moss HA and Elliott TS. The potential for catheter microbial contamination from a needleless connector. J Hosp Infect 1997;36:181-9

330. Cookson ST, Ihrig M, O'Mara EM, et al. Increased bloodstream infection rates in surgical patients associated with variation from recommended use and care following implementation of a needleless device. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 1998;19:23-7

331. Seymour VM, Dhallu TS, Moss HA, Tebbs SE and Elliot TS. A prospective clinical study to investigate the microbial contamination of a needleless connector. J Hosp Infect 2000;45:165-8

332. Luebke MA, Arduino MJ, Duda DL, et al. Comparison of the microbial barrier properties of a needleless and a conventional needle-based intravenous access system. Am J Infect Control 1998;26:437-41

333. McDonald LC, Banerjee SN and Jarvis WR. Line-associated bloodstream infections in pediatric intensive-care-unit patients associated with a needleless device and intermittent intravenous therapy. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 1998;19:772-7

Formatted: French (France)

2577 334. Mendelson MH, Short LJ, Schechter CB, et al. Study of a needleless intermittent
2578 intravenous-access system for peripheral infusions: analysis of staff, patient, and
2579 institutional outcomes. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 1998;19:401-6
2580 335. Do AN, Ray BJ, Banerjee SN, et al. Bloodstream infection associated with
2581 needleless device use and the importance of infection-control practices in the home health
2582 care setting. J Infect Dis 1999;179:442-8
2583 336. Rupp ME, Sholtz LA, Jourdan DR, et al. Outbreak of bloodstream infection
2584 temporally associated with the use of an intravascular needleless valve. Clin Infect Dis
2585 2007;44:1408-14
2586 337. Salgado CD, Chinnes L, Paczesny TH and Cantey JR. Increased rate of catheter-
2587 related bloodstream infection associated with use of a needleless mechanical valve device
2588 at a long-term acute care hospital. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2007;28:684-8
2589 338. Maragakis LL, Bradley KL, Song X, et al. Increased catheter-related bloodstream
2590 infection rates after the introduction of a new mechanical valve intravenous access port.
2591 Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2006;27:67-70
2592 339. Field K, McFarlane C, Cheng AC, et al. Incidence of catheter-related bloodstream
2593 infection among patients with a needleless, mechanical valve-based intravenous
2594 connector in an Australian hematology-oncology unit. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol
2595 2007;28:610-3
2596 340. Inoue Y, Nezu R, Matsuda H, et al. Prevention of catheter-related sepsis during
2597 parenteral nutrition: effect of a new connection device. J Parenter Enteral Nutr
2598 1992;16:581-5

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

2599 341. Yebenes JC, Vidaur L, Serra-Prat M, et al. Prevention of catheter-related
2600 bloodstream infection in critically ill patients using a disinfectable, needle-free connector:
2601 a randomized controlled trial. Am J Infect Control 2004;32:291-5
2602 342. Casey AL, Burnell S, Whinn H, Worthington T, Faroqui MH and Elliott TS. A
2603 prospective clinical trial to evaluate the microbial barrier of a needleless connector. J
2604 Hosp Infect 2007;65:212-8
2605 343. Casey AL, Worthington T, Lambert PA, Quinn D, Faroqui MH and Elliott TS. A
2606 randomized, prospective clinical trial to assess the potential infection risk associated with
2607 the PosiFlow needleless connector. J Hosp Infect 2003;54:288-93
2608 344. Esteve F, Pujol M, Limon E, et al. Bloodstream infection related to catheter
2609 connections: a prospective trial of two connection systems. J Hosp Infect 2007;67:30-4
2610 345. Yebenes JC, Delgado M, Sauca G, et al. Efficacy of three different valve systems of
2611 needle-free closed connectors in avoiding access of microorganisms to endovascular
2612 catheters after incorrect handling. Crit Care Med 2008;36:2558-61
2613 346. Menyhay SZ, Maki DG. Disinfection of needleless catheter connectors and access
2614 ports with alcohol may not prevent microbial entry: the promise of a novel antiseptic-
2615 barrier cap. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2006;27:23-7
2616 347. Herruzo-Cabrera R, Garcia-Caballero J, Vera-Cortes ML, et al. Growth of
2617 microorganisms in parenteral nutrient solutions. Am J Hosp Pharm 1984;41:1178-80
2618 348. ASHP guidelines on quality assurance for pharmacy-prepared sterile products.
2619 American Society of Health System Pharmacists. Am J Health Syst Pharm 2000;57:1150-
2620 69

Formatted: Italian (Italy)

Formatted: Portuguese (Brazil)

Formatted: Portuguese (Brazil)

349. Green KA, Mustachi B, Schoer K, Moro D, Blend R and McGeer A. Gadolinium-based MR contrast media: potential for growth of microbial contaminants when single vials are used for multiple patients. AJR Am J Roentgenol 1995;165:669-71

350. Salzman MB, Isenberg HD and Rubin LG. Use of disinfectants to reduce microbial contamination of hubs of vascular catheters. J Clin Microbiol 1993;31:475-9

351. Arrington ME, Gabbert KC, Mazgaj PW and Wolf MT. Multidose vial contamination in anesthesia. Aana J 1990;58:462-6

352. Plott RT, Wagner RF, Jr. and Tyring SK. Iatrogenic contamination of multidose vials in simulated use. A reassessment of current patient injection technique. Arch Dermatol 1990;126:1441-4

353. Didier ME, Fischer S and Maki DG. Total nutrient admixtures appear safer than lipid emulsion alone as regards microbial contamination: growth properties of microbial pathogens at room temperature. JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr 1998;22:291-6

354. Barrett BB, Andersen JW and Anderson KC. Strategies for the avoidance of bacterial contamination of blood components. Transfusion 1993;33:228-33

355. Blajchman MA. Reducing the risk of bacterial contamination of cellular blood components. Dev Biol (Basel) 2000;102:183-93

356. Roth VR, Arduino MJ, Nobiletti J, et al. Transfusion-related sepsis due to Serratia liquefaciens in the United States. Transfusion 2000;40:931-5

357. Wagner SJ, Friedman LI and Dodd RY. Transfusion-associated bacterial sepsis. Clin Microbiol Rev 1994;7:290-302

Formatted: German (Germany)

Formatted: Italian (Italy)

Formatted: Swedish (Sweden)

2642 358. Longfield RN, Smith LP, Longfield JN, Coberly J and Cruess D. Multiple-dose
2643 vials: persistence of bacterial contaminants and infection control implications. Infect
2644 Control 1985;6:194-9
2645 359. Henry B, Plante-Jenkins C and Ostrowska K. An outbreak of Serratia marcescens
2646 associated with the anesthetic agent propofol. Am J Infect Control 2001;29:312-5.
2647 360. Grohskopf LA, Roth VR, Feikin DR, et al. Serratia liquefaciens bloodstream
2648 infections from contamination of epoetin alfa at a hemodialysis center. N Engl J Med
2649 2001;344:1491-7.

2650 361. Thompson ND, Perz JF, Moorman AC and Holmberg SD. Nonhospital healthcare-
2651 associated hepatitis B and C virus transmission: United States, 1998-2008. Ann Intern
2652 Med 2009;150:33-9

2653 362. Costello JM, Morrow DF, Graham DA, Potter-Bynoe G, Sandora TJ and Laussen
2654 PC. Systematic intervention to reduce central line-associated bloodstream infection rates
2655 in a pediatric cardiac intensive care unit. Pediatrics 2008;121:915-23
2656 363. Frankel HL, Crede WB, Topal JE, Roumanis SA, Devlin MW and Foley AB. Use of
2657 corporate Six Sigma performance-improvement strategies to reduce incidence of

2658 catheter-related bloodstream infections in a surgical ICU. J Am Coll Surg 2005;201:349-
2659 58

2660 364. Galpern D, Guerrero A, Tu A, Fahoum B and Wise L. Effectiveness of a central line
2661 bundle campaign on line-associated infections in the intensive care unit. Surgery
2662 2008;144:492-5; discussion 495

2663 365. McKee C, Berkowitz I, Cosgrove SE, et al. Reduction of catheter-associated
2664 bloodstream infections in pediatric patients: experimentation and reality. Pediatr Crit
2665 Care Med 2008;9:40-6
2666 366. Pronovost PJ, Berenholtz SM and Goeschel CA. Improving the quality of
2667 measurement and evaluation in quality improvement efforts. Am J Med Qual
2668 2008;23:143-6
2669 367. Safdar N, Maki DG. Lost in translation. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2006;27:3-7
2670 368. Warren DK, Yokoe DS, Climo MW, et al. Preventing catheter-associated
2671 bloodstream infections: a survey of policies for insertion and care of central venous
2672 catheters from hospitals in the prevention epicenter program. Infect Control Hosp
2673 Epidemiol 2006;27:8-13
2674 369. Krein SL, Hofer TP, Kowalski CP, et al. Use of central venous catheter-related
2675 bloodstream infection prevention practices by US hospitals. Mayo Clin Proc
2676 2007;82:672-8
2677 370. Lobo RD, Levin AS, Gomes LM, et al. Impact of an educational program and policy
2678 changes on decreasing catheter-associated bloodstream infections in a medical intensive
2679 care unit in Brazil. Am J Infect Control 2005;33:83-7
2680 371. Marschall J, Leone C, Jones M, Nihill D, Fraser VJ and Warren DK. Catheter-
2681 associated bloodstream infections in general medical patients outside the intensive care
2682 unit: a surveillance study. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2007;28:905-9
2683 372. Rosenthal VD, McCormick RD, Guzman S, Villamayor C and Orellano PW. Effect
2684 of education and performance feedback on handwashing: the benefit of administrative
2685 support in Argentinean hospitals. Am J Infect Control 2003;31:85-92

Formatted: German (Germany)

2686 373. Gastmeier P, Geffers C. Prevention of catheter-related bloodstream infections:
2687 analysis of studies published between 2002 and 2005. J Hosp Infect 2006;64:326-35
2688 374. Shapey IM, Foster MA, Whitehouse T, Jumaa P and Bion JF. Central venous
2689 catheter-related bloodstream infections: improving post-insertion catheter care. J Hosp
2690 Infect 2009;71:117-22
2691
2692